DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 420	UD 015 558
AUTHOR	Brody, Lawrence; Schenker, Hank
TITLE	Discovering and Developing the College Potential of Disadvantaged High School Youth. A Report of the Sixth Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program. Report No. 72-6.
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Office of Teacher Education.
REPORT NO	CUNY-R-72-6
PUB DATE	Jun 73
NOTE	165p.; For related reports, see UD 015 556-557
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$8.24 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; City Wide Programs; *College Preparation; *Counseling Instructional Programs; Culturally Disadvantaged; *Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; Ethnic Groups; Grade 9; *High School Students; Longitudinal Studies; Minority Groups; Program Descriptions; Recreational Programs; Remedial Programs; Special Programs; Student Development; Underachievers
IDENTIFIERS	CDDP; City University of New York; *College Discovery and Development Program; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This report is the sixth in a series of longitudinal studies describing the College Discovery and Development Program aimed at identifying disadvantaged and under achieving ninth graders and developing their college potential in five special high school development centers. The sixth year brought the completion of the discovery and development cycle for the first of its students, those who had completed their studies with associate degrees, and the mid-college point for the first baccalaureate students. Various sections include descriptions of the sixth year of the program, personnel, facilities, the sixth population of students, attendance and achievement for all classes in 1970-71, college progress for classes I-III, high school graduation and admission to college for class IV, and a summary. Class VI resembled the previous five on all variables except for a lower income. The general findings for program students whose college records can be studied show a pattern of progress not greatly different from that of nonprogram classmates in each college. A number of newly stated specifically expressed behavioral objectives were added to the proposal for funding for the sixth year. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED113420

OFFICE OF
TEACHER
EDUCATION
OF THE
CITY UNIVERSITY
OF NEW YORK

DISCOVERING AND DEVELOPING THE COLLEGE POTENTIAL
OF
DISADVANTAGED HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH

A Report of the Sixth Year of a Longitudinal Study
on
THE COLLEGE DISCOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Lawrence Brody
Director

Wanetta Young
Assistant Director

Sharon Gilbert
Field Coordinator

Hank Schenker
Research Coordinator

Research Assistants:

Stan Bernknopf
James Carroll
Martha Feldman
Iris Goldberg
Edith Katz
Catherine Ridley
Blanca Vazquez
John Whitmire

Liliane Karol
Adjunct Lecturer

Report No. 72-6

UD015558

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOREWORD

This volume is the sixth in a series of reports of a longitudinal study of the College Discovery and Development Program, Prong II. Five previous reports issued under this same title, Discovering and Developing the College Potential of Disadvantaged High School Youth, are listed below:

First - Daniel Tanner and Genaro Lachica, January 1967

Second - Lawrence Brody, Beatrice Harris and Genaro Lachica, (Report #68-2), March 1968

Third - Lawrence Brody, Beatrice Harris and Genaro Lachica, (Report #69-1), March 1969

Fourth - Beatrice Harris and Lawrence Brody, (Report #70-13), June 1970

Fifth - Lawrence Brody and Hank Schenker, (Report #71-5), January 1972

This sixth year brought the completion of the discovery and development cycle for the first of its students, those who had completed their studies with associate degrees, and the mid-college point for the first CDD baccalaureate students.

3

OCT 17 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD.. i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.. iv

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, 1970-1971................... viii

ADVISORY POLICY COMMITTEE, 1970-1971...................... ix

COMMITTEE ON COORDINATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 1970-1971.................. xii

FACULTIES OF THE HIGH SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT CENTERS, 1970-1971.............................. xiii

COLLEGE CURRICULUM CONSULTANTS, 1970-1971................. xv

LIST OF TABLES.. xvi

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION.. 1

- The Sixth Year of the CDD Program.................... 1
- Personnel.. 1
- Facilities... 3

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SIXTH POPULATION OF COLLEGE DISCOVERY STUDENTS........................ 5

- Socio-economic Data.................................. 6
  - Sex Distribution................................. 6
  - Ethnic Distribution.............................. 6
  - Age in Years..................................... 9
  - Family Structure................................. 9
  - Living Conditions................................ 13
  - Economic Data.................................... 13
  - Employment of Parents............................ 20
  - Birthplace of Students and Parents............... 23
  - Language Most Spoken at Home..................... 23
  - Education of Parents............................. 27
  - Years at Present Address......................... 27
  - Number of Schools Attended....................... 27
  - Adjusted Life Chances Scale Score................ 33
  - Comparison of the Five Centers on Socio-economic Data for Class VI.................. 33

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

CHAPTER PAGE

Previous Achievement 36
Comparison of the Five Centers on Previous Achievement 49
Retention Data 53
Summary 56

3 ATTENDANCE AND ACHIEVEMENT, ALL CLASSES, 1970-1971 59

Fall Semester 60
  Class IV 60
  Class V 60
  Class VI 65
  Comparisons Between Centers 65

Spring Semester 68
  Class IV 68
  Class V 73
  Class VI 77
  Comparisons Between Centers 81
  Summary 81

4 COLLEGE PROGRESS OF CDD STUDENTS IN CLASSES I, II and III 85

College Status of CDD Students Attending The City University of New York 86
College Status of CDD Students Attending Non-CUNY Institutions 95
College Academic Performance of CDD Graduates by Semester 97
Comparisons of Academic Performance of Classes I, II, and III 100
Summary 105

5 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION AND ADMISSION TO COLLEGE: CLASS IV 106

6 SUMMARY 110

REFERENCES 117

APPENDIX A: Analysis of Variance Summary Tables for Chapter 2. 118

APPENDIX B: Analysis of Variance Summary Tables for Chapter 3. 128

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The College Discovery and Development Program staff is grateful to Chancellor Albert H. Bowker, Dean Benjamin Rosner, Dean Lester A. Brailey, Dean James J. McGrath, Dean Howard Irby and Mrs. Esther Gordon for their continued support, encouragement and knowledgeable assistance in the times of difficulty which occurred during this sixth year of the program's operation.

Mr. Irving Anker, Acting Superintendent of Schools, and Dr. Harvey Scribner, Chancellor, successively approved and supported this sixth year's work. Dr. Seelig Lester, Executive Deputy Superintendent in charge of Instruction, Mr. Jacob Zack, Assistant Superintendent of the Office of High Schools, Mrs. Helene Lloyd, Assistant Superintendent in charge of the Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs and Mr. Gene Satin of that office have all been most helpful. Mrs. Daisy K. Shaw, Director of the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance, and Mrs. Cecilia Sarasohn, Assistant Director, Dr. Wayne Wrightstone, Director and Dr. Samuel D. McClelland, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Educational Research have guided and counseled our staff and contributed many hours of the day-to-day supportive services underlying a large scale operative project.

We congratulate Miss Florence Myers and wish her health and happiness in her superbly well merited retirement: her contributions to the College Discovery and Development Program are beyond cataloging. Every facet of the program's structure and processes bears the

fingerprints of her shaping. The design of the underlying program foundation came in considerable measure from insights from earlier activities in which Florence Myers had been an important worker. Our students and staff owe much to Florence Myers: we thank her and wish her well.

To Mr. Leff LaHuta, Coordinator for the Board of Education, who took over Miss Myers' responsibilities, we extend our thanks and appreciation for the smoothness of the transition and the cool professional competence of his administrative efforts.

Mr. Melvin Taylor served enthusiastically and well as Assistant Director, during part of this sixth year. The wealth of his professional experience and personal insights were sorely missed when the inexorable pressures of educational change in our time took him from us to become Principal of a New York City high school.

Mrs. Wanetta Young, Assistant Director replacing Mr. Taylor, has shared in the problems and carried an inordinate personal load: she has been an essential part of the continued success of the program as well as a facilitator improving relationships among its student, staff and parent personnel. This official expression of acknowledgement is only a token of our appreciation. Mr. Hank Schenker, Research Coordinator maintained the functions of his new office in this sixth year with efficiency, good cheer and calm graciousness. His pursuit of objectivity in handling and interpreting data, his management of the training and supervision of junior aides in research tasks and his dedication to the daily tasks associated have been very important factors in this study.

It is a source of professional gratification to be able to formally acknowledge this debt to Mr. Schenker here.

To our Research Assistants in this sixth year, Ms. Simone Arons, Mr. Stanley Bernknopf, Ms. Martha Feldman, Ms. Sharon Gilbert and Mr. Michael Lurie we acknowledge our debt: their responsibilities have been complex and frequently shifting. Their workload was always heavy and the facilities available to them, changing and frequently overcrowded and inconvenient during this year. Their noteworthy cheerfulness, dedication and efficiency were matched by those of our two secretaries, Mrs. Paulette Satherswaite Bryan and Miss Edith Handlin. The entire CDD staff joins in publicly and officially thanking them; their unflagging devotion continued this year to be a crucial key to continued successful program implementation.

Once again, in this sixth year, our College Curriculum Consultants struggled valiantly with their complex role to be influential forces in the improvement of the professional efforts of teachers while officially not members of the school faculty or its authority structure is a most difficult task. That this task was effectively performed so much of the time is attested by our students' success as well as teacher comment. We honor the consultants for their work.

However, we recognize and acknowledge here the deep debt of gratitude which we owe, with all our CDD students, to the high school faculties. A major portion of the program's success must be attributed to the work of the principals, administrative assistants, department chairmen, school coordinators, guidance counselors, teachers and family assistants in the five host high schools. Their daily devotion to duty and concern beyond any official claim for the continuous growth of College Discovery students have continued to be the major factor in our students' successes. Their sharing of efforts, ideas, data and information and their personal thoughts have been ingredients without which our functions as the CUNY component of the program would have been impossible. We have not always been in agreement on how to do what, when to do it, and occasionally, why we should, but their honesty, energy and good will have always prevailed. We thank you all, anonymously for the moment in the interests of desperately needed economy and in the recognition that our formal thanks are so much less important than the debt in the emotions and minds of the students we have been privileged to share with you.

We also thank the Advisory Policy Committee members for their efforts on behalf of this program: their generous contributions of time, thought and feeling have been vital to our work. Their ideas, suggestions and concerns have at all stages of this sixth year been instrumental in guiding us to weaknesses, providing clues to means of increasing successes, and helping us all to understand how we can best help each other in these trying and increasingly more difficult times.

Finally, we express our gratitude to The State of New York, The City of New York and the United States Office of Education whose financial support continues to be the food and oxygen of College Discovery and Development's life.

Lawrence Brody,
Director

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1970-1971

Lester A. Brailey, Dean of Admissions Services, The City University of New York.

Lawrence Brody, Director, College Discovery and Development Program, The City University of New York.

Leff LaHuta, Project Coordinator, College Discovery and Development, Board of Education, The City of New York.

Seelig Lester, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education, The City of New York.

Helene Lloyd, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education, The City of New York.

Stuart C. Lucey, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education, The City of New York.

Benjamin Rosner, Dean of Teacher Education, The City University of New York.

Gene Satin, Director, ESEA Title I, Board of Education, The City of New York.

Jacob Zack, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education, The City of New York.

ADVISORY POLICY COMMITTEE

1970-1971

NAME	REPRESENTING
Dr. Lawrence Brody, Director	College Discovery and Development
Mrs. Wanetta Young, Assistant Director*	" " " "
Mr. Melvin Taylor, Assistant Director**	" " " "
Dr. Albert H. Bowker	Chancellor
Mr. Leff LaHuta	Board of Education
Dr. Florence Freedman	Faculty - College
Mrs. Mamie Stone	Upward Bound
Mr. Larry Dais	Upward Bound
Mr. Sidney Wexler	Theodore Roosevelt High School
Mr. Moley C. Wilson	Thomas Jefferson High School
Mr. Gilbert Kessler	Seward Park High School
Mrs. Ida Gottlieb	Jamaica High School
Mr. Daniel Driscoll	Port Richmond High School

Parents

Mrs. Doris Kemp	Bronx
Mrs. Melissa Burnett	Bronx
Mrs. Adell Simpson	Queens
Mrs. G. Murray	Queens
Mrs. Eunice Bell	Brooklyn
Mrs. Betty Nelson	Brooklyn
Mrs. Sheila Ostacher	Staten Island
Mrs. Elizabeth White	New York
Mrs. Gloria Ferrin	New York

* (Appointed April 1971)
** (Resigned October 1970)

Students

Harry Hernandez	Bronx
Juanita Powell	Bronx
Douglas Smith	Bronx
Pamela Murray	Queens
Cindy Simpson	Brooklyn
Kermit Bostock	Brooklyn
Evertone Edmundson	Brooklyn
Gail Laboard	Staten Island
Arthur Newcombe	Staten Island
Norman White	New York
Lolita Ferrin	New York
George Thompson	New York
Charlene Davis	New York

	Community Progress Centers
Miss Maria Fauuzzi	Hunts Point Community Progress Center
Mr. Peter Atkins	" " " "
Mrs. Carmen Caben	" " " "
Mr. Carter Perry	Morrisania Community Progress Center
Mr. Jerome Greene	" " "
Mr. Richard Downs	South Bronx Community Progress Center
Miss Lynn Perez	" " " "
Mr. John E. Williams	East New York Community Corp. Inc.
Mr. Lloyd Mapp	" " " " "

	Community Progress Centers
Mr. Paul J. Cooper	Brownsville Community Council
Mr. Carmelo Negron	Lower East Side Community Corp.
Mr. Francisco Archilla	" " " " "
Mr. Charles McDowell	Lower West Side Community Corp.
Mr. Silke Hansen	" " " " "
Mrs. Dorothy Orr	HARYOU-ACT
Mrs. Helen Testamark	" "
Mr. Herman Flowers	Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth-In-Action
Miss Sonia Allen	" " " "
Mr. Bertram Beck	Mobilization for Youth
Dr. Harold Weissman	" " "
Mr. Eugene Sharpe	South Jamaica Community Corp.
Miss Selma Martin	South Brooklyn Community Anti-Poverty Corp.

COMMITTEE ON COORDINATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

1970-1971

David B. Austin, Dean of Education, Richmond College

Theodore Benjamin, Dean of Education, Lehman College

Doyle M. Bortner, Dean of Education, The City College

Milton Gold, Dean of Education, Hunter College

Gerald Leinwand, Dean of Education, Baruch School of Business and Public Administration

Jack Roberts, Dean of Education, Queens College

Louis Rosenzweig, Dean of Teacher Education, The City University of New York

Benjamin Rosner, Dean of Teacher Education, The City University of New York

Wallace Schoenberg, Dean of Education, York College

FACULTIES OF THE HIGH SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

1970-1971

Theodore Roosevelt High School

Principal:	Henry Saltman
Administrative Assistant:	Howard McManus Lester Newman
Coordinator:	Sidney Waxler
Guidance Counselors:	William Artz Darrel Halliday Morey Stein
Project Secretary:	Louise Robbins

Thomas Jefferson High School

Principal:	Margaret Baird
Administrative Assistant:	Frances Dickman Irving Mallow
Coordinator:	Moley C. Wilson
Guidance Counselors:	Seymour Berdy Esther Schneberg Marion Zack
Project Secretary:	Esther Goldberg

Seward Park High School

Principal	Rubin Maloff
Administrative Assistant:	Teresa Gloster Mitchell Schulich
Coordinator:	Gilbert W. Kessler
Guidance Counselors:	Bernard Alfant Bessie Friedman Selma Lashine
Project Secretary:	Elsie Kessler

Jamaica High School

Principal:	Louis A. Shuker
Administrative Assistant:	Jack Groveman Aaron Rose
Coordinator:	Ida Gottlieb
Counselors:	Larry Edwards Paul Rosenberg Lawrence Shoglow
Project Secretary:	Shirley Heller

Port Richmond High School

Principal:	Bernard Fettman
Administrative Assistant:	Beverly Engles Isaac Feinberg
Coordinator:	Daniel J. Driscoll
Counselors:	Mildred Brennan Ann Markey John Nevins
Project Secretary:	Helen Slocum

COLLEGE CURRICULUM CONSULTANTS

1970-1971

Dora S. Bashour, Foreign Languages, Division of Teacher Education

Edward Chavez, Science, Hunter College

David Cooper, English, Hunter College

Martin Feldman, Social Studies, Kingsborough Community College

Helen Fernandez, Foreign Languages, Hunter College

Florence Freedman, English, Hunter College

William F. Goins, Science, Brooklyn College

Anne S. Grossman, Mathematics, Lehman College

Paul Kahn, Science, Brooklyn College

Robert Lacompagna, English, The City College

Anita Levine, Guidance, Brooklyn College

Maureen Marazzi, English, Brooklyn College

Joan Shea, Guidance, Brooklyn College

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

2-1 College Enrollment by Center and Sex for the Tenth Year: Class VI........................ 7

2-2 Ethnic Distribution: Class VI........................ 8

2-3 Age in Years: Class VI................................ 10

2-4 Family Status: Class VI................................ 11

2-5 Head of Household: Class VI........................ 12

2-6 Type of Dwelling: Class VI........................ 14

2-7 Number of Rooms per Household: Class VI.............. 15

2-8 Number of Persons per Household: Class VI............ 16

2-9 Number of Persons per Room in Household: Class VI..... 17

2-10 Living Space: Class VI................................ 18

2-11 Monthly Rent: Class VI................................ 19

2-12 Total Weekly Income: Class VI........................ 21

2-13 Mother's Occupation: Class VI........................ 22

2-14 Father's Occupation: Class VI........................ 22

2-15 Student's Birthplace: Class VI........................ 24

2-16 Mother's Birthplace: Class VI........................ 25

2-17 Father's Birthplace: Class VI........................ 26

2-18 Language Most Spoken at Home: Class VI................ 28

2-19 Father's Education: Class VI........................ 29

2-20 Mother's Education: Class VI........................ 30

2-21 Years at Present Address: Class VI.................... 31

2-22 Number of Schools Attended Through First Nine Years of School: Class VI........................ 32

2-23 Adjusted Life Chances Scale Score: Class VI........... 34

2-24 Significance Levels Obtained from the Analyses of Variance Comparing Five Centers on Socioeconomic Data for Class VI.............................. 35

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

TABLE PAGE

2-25 Seventh Grade General Average: Class VI 37

2-26 Eighth Grade General Average: Class VI 38

2-27 Mid-Year Ninth Grade General Average: Class VI 39

2-28 Metropolitan Achievement Test - Paragraph Meaning: Class VI 41

2-29 Metropolitan Achievement Test - Vocabulary: Class VI 42

2-30 Metropolitan Achievement Test - Average of Paragraph Meaning and Vocabulary: Class VI 43

2-31 Metropolitan Achievement Test - Computation - Class VI 44

2-32 Metropolitan Achievement Test - Problem Solving: Class VI 45

2-33 Metropolitan Achievement Test - Average of Computation and Problem Solving: Class VI 46

2-34 Frequency Distribution of Metropolitan Achievement Tests Reading Averages and Mid-9th Grade General Averages: Class VI 48

2-35 Frequency Distribution of Metropolitan Achievement Tests Mathematics Averages and Mid-9th Grade General Averages: Class VI 50

2-36 Number of Days Absent Fall Semester of Ninth Grade: Class VI 51

2-37 Significance Levels Obtained from the Analyses of Variance Comparing Five Centers on Previous Achievement and Attendance: Class VI 52

2-38 Retention Data: Class VI 54

2-39 Reasons for Dropping: Class VI 55

2-40 Means and Standard Deviation for All Centers Combined on Socio-economic and Academic Measures 58

3-1 Fall Semester - General Average: Class IV 61

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

TABLE		PAGE
3-2	Fall Semester - English Regents: Class IV	61
3-3	Fall Semester - Math Regents: Class IV	62
3-4	Fall Semester - Absences: Class IV	62
3-5	Fall Semester - General Average: Class V	63
3-6	Fall Semester - Math Regents: Class V	63
3-7	Fall Semester - Absences: Class V	64
3-8	Fall Semester - General Average: Class VI	64
3-9	Fall Semester - Math Regents: Class VI	66
3-10	Fall Semester - Absences: Class VI	66
3-11	Significance Levels Obtained From the Analyses of Variance Comparing Five Centers on Fall Semester Academic Performance and Attendance. Classes IV, V and VI	67
3-12	Spring Semester - General Average: Class IV	69
3-13	Spring Semester - English Regents: Class IV	69
3-14	Spring Semester - History Regents: Class IV	70
3-15	Spring Semester - Math Regents: Class IV	70
3-16	Spring Semester - Science Regents: Class IV	71
3-17	Spring Semester - Foreign Language Regents: Class IV	71
3-18	Spring Semester - Absences: Class IV	72
3-19	Spring Semester - Total Absences: Class IV	72
3-20	Spring Semester - General Average: Class V	74
3-21	Spring Semester - Math Regents: Class V	74
3-22	Spring Semester - Science Regents: Class V	75
3-23	Spring Semester - Foreign Language Regents: Class V	75

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

TABLE PAGE

3-24 Spring Semester - Absences: Class V 76

3-25 Total Absences 1970-71: Class V 76

3-26 Spring Semester - General Average: Class VI 78

3-27 Spring Semester - Math Regents: Class VI 78

3-28 Spring Semester - Science Regents: Class VI 79

3-29 Spring Semester - Foreign Language Regents: Class VI 79

3-30 Spring Semester - Absences: Class VI 80

3-31 Spring Semester - Total Absences: Class VI 80

3-32 Significance Levels Obtained from the Analyses of Variance Comparing Five Centers on Spring Semester Academic Performance and Attendance: Class IV, V and VI 82

3-33 Summary of Fall Semester Academic Performance and Attendance: (All Centers Combined) Classes IV, V and VI 83

3-34 Summary of Spring Semester Academic Performance and Attendance: (All Centers Combined) Classes IV, V and VI 84

4-1 Status of Class I Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Community Colleges 88

4-2 Status of Class I Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Senior Colleges 89

4-3 Status of Class II Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Community Colleges 90

4-4 Status of Class II Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Senior Colleges 91

4-5 Status of Class III Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Community Colleges 92

4-6 Status of Class III Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Senior Colleges 92

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

TABLE		PAGE
4-7	Percentage of Classes I, II and III Students Enrolled After One Semester and One Year of College Work Compared with Open-Admissions Students and Regular Freshmen.............	94
4-8	College Discovery Graduates Entering Non-CUNY Institutions.................................	96
4-9	College Academic Performance of Class I Graduates by Semester................................	98
4-10	College Academic Performance of Class II Graduates by Semester................................	99
4-11	College Academic Performance of Class III Graduates by Semester................................	99
4-12	Grade Point Averages for the First Semester: Classes I, II and III................................	102
4-13	Summary of Analysis of Variance of First Semester to Grade Point Averages: Classes I, II and III..	102
4-14	Grade Point Averages for the Second Semester: Classes I, II and III.....................	103
4-15	Summary of Analysis of Variance of Second Semester Grade Point Averages: Classes I, II and III..	103
4-16	Cumulative GPA's by Semester for CDD I, II and III..	104
5-1	Diplomas Issued....................................	107
5-2	Post-Secondary Disposition of CDD IV Graduates (Showing PDD Graduates)....................	108

22

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

June 1971 marked the completion of six years of continuous implementation of the College Discovery and Development Program as a joint undertaking of the New York City Public Schools and The City University of New York. This volume is the sixth annual report describing the program, its planned objectives and the participating students for the academic year which began in September 1970 and ended in June 1971.

As in previous years there were three successive classes enrolled this year in the high school phase of the program: CDD IV, admitted to tenth grade in September 1968; CDD V admitted in September 1969; and, CDD VI, admitted in September 1970. There were also in attendance at the CD Centers a small number of students from prior classes who continued to work toward completion of their graduation requirements later in the cycle than their original classmates.

During the 1970-71 year graduates of three former CDD classes, CDD I, II, and III, were in college attendance at many institutions. A small group had completed their studies for Associate degrees and some had entered the junior class in four-year college programs.

The Sixth Year of the CDD Program

The basic plans and organization of the College Discovery and Development Program continued without major change during this sixth year of implementation from September 1970 through June 1971.

Personnel

There were again numerous personnel changes, most resulting from forces outside the program itself. Thus among the high school principals only one of the five with whom the program had been planned and originally implemented remained as an executive in a CDD host high school. A considerable number of the high school department Chairmen were also newly assigned and most of them had not had previous experience with the program. Among the teachers, a considerable fraction were without prior CDD experience as a result of new appointments, transfers, and promotions of teachers to other responsibilities on the teaching faculty. Among the personnel of the five CDD Centers one new coordinator with one semester of experience as a teacher in CDD joined the four veteran coordinators. Five additional counselors were newly appointed. Together with the replacements for veteran counselors who had left this brought the counseling staff to a total of fifteen. However a number of these counselors had not held CDD responsibility before nor had several of their new family assistants.

In the CUNY-CDD office there was an assistant director new to CDD but who had had broad experience in Upward Bound programs following his years as a veteran science instructor in a New York "inner city" high school. That this teacher was co-opted early in the school year by the community and the Board of Education to serve as principal of the high school in which he had formerly taught was CDD's misfortune although it was, perhaps, a wry tribute to the program's staff selection criteria and processes. There were also several new people among the CUNY Research Assistants; again as in former years, this was a result of the completion of graduate study by former incumbents. Among the College Curriculum Consultants there were considerable changes: the net total weekly consultant time assigned to CDD was severely reduced during 1970-71. This was primarily a result of sharply increased registration and resultant staff pressure in the colleges growing out of implementation of the Open Admissions Program.

Finally, as a completely unintended consequence of a shift in administrative control of College Work Study Grant funds and recruitment from CDD to the nineteen individual Financial Aid Officers on CUNY college campuses, there was a drastic reduction in the number and quality of tutors available to CDD students throughout this program year.

Facilities

The CD Centers remained in the same five high schools as for the previous five years: these were Jamaica, Port Richmond, Seward Park, Theodore Roosevelt and Thomas Jefferson High Schools. There was no major change in the facilities available to the CD Centers in their host schools during 1970-71; although repairs and renovations begun previously had been completed this year in all schools, the net change in available space was small, since changes in school zones had created increased non-CDD enrollments in the host schools. In fact, in three of the five schools slightly less space was available than before; however, all schools were able to provide at least minimal space for the third CDD-guidance counselor assigned them this year. As in former years private space for counseling was scarce or non-existent; it was an accepted practice for some CDD counselors to meet small groups for guidance in their offices, or in a corridor or in the back of the auditorium. In one school the writer observed eight students plus a family assistant and the counselor in a group guidance session in this counselor's office: a six and a half by eight foot section of a larger room, sectioned off by five foot high steel and glass partitions. In two of the five schools no two members of the CDD Center staff were located in the same part of the building: one result was that the "school within a school" concept was considerably less well developed in those centers than in the other three schools where frequent staff and student interaction was geographically structured into daily program operations.

CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTION OF THE SIXTH POPULATION OF COLLEGE DISCOVERY STUDENTS

In September, 1970, the sixth population of College Discovery students (Class VI) entered the program. They were selected, as in previous years, from applications received in Spring, 1970 from New York City public and parochial schools which contained a ninth grade, and from community agencies throughout the five boroughs. Students were selected on the basis of economic and academic criteria which were summarized in a previous report.[1] Notification of admission was sent to students in the spring semester of their ninth grade; the students who accepted the CDD Program entered the CDD center most conveniently located for them in September. As in all previous classes, a small number of selected applicants declined this preferred enrollment for various reasons.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the sixth entering population of the College Discovery Program in terms of the socio-economic background and the academic ability of each student prior to entering the program. In addition, a brief final section will provide retention data for this class covering the period from September 1970 to September 1971 (their first year in the program). The socio-economic portion of this chapter will deal with such variables as family income, living conditions, and the occupational and educational history of parents. Academic ability will be described in terms of seventh, eighth, and mid-year ninth grade general averages and scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. All information used in the first two portions of the chapter is derived from information taken from either the personal information form that each student filled out when applying to the program or from the nomination form completed by each student's ninth grade counselor or the referring person.

---

[1] Lawrence Brody, Beatrice Harris and Genaro Lachica, Discovering and Developing the College Potential of Disadvantaged High School Youth: A Report of the Third Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program, Office of Research and Evaluation, City University of New York, March 1969, p. 2.

Socio-economic Data

Sex Distribution

Table 2-1 shows the distribution of male and female students in Class VI as it was in September of 1970. Although the total number of males and females throughout all five Centers differ by only six students, larger differences do exist within the individual Centers. Center V selected more males than females and Center IV selected more females than males. Since an attempt is made to balance the sex ratio, any deviation from this principal arises from availability of eligible applicants, not from design.

Ethnic Distribution

The ethnic distribution for Class VI in the five development Centers is presented in Table 2-2. Approximately 59% of this total entering population were Black students. Twenty-four percent were of Puerto Rican background, three percent of Oriental background and 15% fell into an all inclusive category of Other, composed primarily of White students.

Ethnicity is not a criterion for acceptance into the CDD Program. Ethnic information, therefore, is not collected until students enter the program in September. Differences in ethnic percentages may represent the relationship between ethnicity and the variables, both socio-economic and academic, used for the selection of students for this program. It is also possible that

TABLE 2-1

College Discovery Enrollment by Center and Sex
for the Tenth Year
Class VI

Center	Male		Female		Both Sexes	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	51	45.5	61	54.5	112	100
II	57	52.3	52	47.7	109	100
III	57	46.0	67	54.0	124	100
IV	38	40.4	56	59.6	94	100
V	62	72.9	23	27.1	85	100
All Centers	265	50.6	259	49.4	524	100

TABLE 2-2

Ethnic Distribution

Class VI

Center	Black		Puerto Rican		Oriental		Other		All Groups
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
I	65	58.0	39	34.8	1	0.9	7	6.3	112
II	78	71.6	28	25.7	0	0.0	3	2.7	109
III	57	46.0	44	35.5	14	11.3	9	7.3	124
IV	79	84.0	4	4.3	0	0.0	11	11.7	94
V	28	32.9	9	10.6	1	1.2	47	55.3	85
All Centers	307	58.6	124	23.7	16	3.1	77	14.7	524

The sum of the percentages in this table and succeeding ones will not always be 100.0% due to rounding.

unintended selections for ethnicity may have occurred as individual ninth grade counselors and/or community agency personnel referred students to the College Discovery and Development Program.

Age in Years

Table 2-3 shows the distribution of the age in years of Class VI students. These figures represent the age of students as of September 1970, the beginning of their tenth grade. As can be seen, the great majority of students are approximately 15 years old, with very slight variation between Centers.

Family Structure

Since the structure of a student's family is thought to be moderately related to his emotional and academic success, a fairly complete analysis has been done on the intactness of the family setting of Class VI students. This material is provided in Tables 2-4 and 2-5. Table 2-4 shows that slightly more than half (55.1%) of Class VI students are living with a mother and a father. The reader should know that this 55.1% includes approximately 2% of students who are actually living with one or two stepparents but considered these parents as their natural parents in filling out their personal information forms.

Another way to view this data is that 61.8% (a total of the first three categories in Table 2-5) are living in a two-parent household. An additional 31.8% of Class VI students are living with one parent, 4.0% are living with a guardian or foster parents and 0.9% (five students) live in an institutional setting.

TABLE 2-3

Age in Years

Class VI

CENTER	NUMBER OF RESPONDING STUDENTS	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING
I	112	15.38	0.57	0
II	108	15.40	0.60	1
III	124	15.51	0.57	0
IV	94	15.23	0.44	0
V	85	15.33	0.44	0
ALL CENTERS	523	15.38	0.54	1

TABLE 2-4

Family Status

Class VI

Center	Parents Together		Parents Separated		Father Deceased		Mother Deceased		Both Deceased		No Information		Question Not Applicable		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	42	37.5	48	42.9	9	8.0	2	1.8	1	0.9	10	8.9	0	0.0	112	100.0
II	56	51.4	32	29.4	8	7.3	2	1.8	0	0.0	11	10.1	0	0.0	109	100.0
III	81	65.3	26	21.0	7	5.6	2	1.6	1	0.8	7	5.6	0	0.0	124	99.9
IV	58	61.7	22	23.4	8	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	6.4	0	0.0	94	100.0
V	52	61.2	18	21.2	9	10.6	2	2.3	0	0.0	4	4.7	0	0.0	85	100.0
All Centers	289	55.1	146	27.9	41	7.8	8	1.5	2	0.4	38	7.3	0	0.0	524	100.0

TABLE 2-5

Head of Household

Class VI

Center	Mother and Father		Mother and Stepfather		Father and Stepmother		Mother		Father		Guardian		Foster Parents		Institution		Other		No Information		Question Not Applicable		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	41	36.6	9	8.0	4	3.6	53	47.3	0	0.0	4	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	112	100.0
II	57	52.3	7	6.4	1	0.9	34	31.2	3	2.7	4	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.7	0	0.0	109	99.9
III	79	63.7	9	7.3	1	0.8	29	23.4	1	0.8	5	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	124	100.0
IV	54	57.4	5	5.3	1	1.1	25	26.6	1	1.1	3	3.2	3	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.1	0	0.0	94	100.0
V	50	58.8	5	5.9	1	1.2	19	22.3	2	2.3	2	2.3	0	0.0	5	5.9	0	0.0	1	1.2	0	0.0	85	99.9
All Centers	281	53.6	35	6.7	8	1.5	160	30.5	7	1.3	18	3.4	3	0.6	5	0.9	0	0.0	7	1.3	0	0.0	524	99.8

Living Conditions

Tables 2-6, 2-7, 2-8, 2-9 and 2-10 provide information regarding the living conditions of Class VI students as was reported in the spring of 1970. The type of dwellings reported by Class VI students is shown in Table 2-6. A large portion of these students live in an apartment (75.2%) while 20.2% report that their parents own their own homes. The average number of rooms in each Class VI dwelling is shown in Table 2-7. The mean across Centers is 5.06. Table 2-8 shows that between five and six people, on the average, make up a Class VI household. Information regarding living space is provided in Tables 2-9 and 2-10. For each household the ratio of number of rooms to number of people was computed and a mean ratio across Centers of 1.07 is shown in Table 2-9. This figure would indicate that on the average Class VI students do not live in overcrowded living conditions. A household is considered to be overcrowded if there is not at least one room per person. Table 2-10 has been provided in order to indicate more clearly just how many Class VI students do live in overcrowded conditions. Of those students who provided us with the necessary information, 42.1% do live in households that are composed of less than one room per person. This is considered to be a conservative estimate since the operational definition of overcrowded that was used excluded some families that do not in fact have enough space.

Economic Data

Table 2-11 summarizes rent paid by Class VI families. The lowest average monthly rent ($83.61) was paid by Center III families, while the highest average monthly rent ($132.18) was paid by families in Center V.

TABLE 2-6

Type of Dwelling

Class VI

Center	Apartment		Own Home		Institution		No Information		Question Not Applicable		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	103	92.0	6	5.3	0	0.0	3	2.7	0	0.0	112	100.0
II	90	82.6	14	12.8	0	0.0	5	4.6	0	0.0	109	100.0
III	120	96.8	1	0.8	1	0.8	2	1.6	0	0.0	124	100.0
IV	39	41.5	49	52.1	0	0.0	6	6.4	0	0.0	94	100.0
V	42	49.4	36	42.4	5	5.9	2	2.3	0	0.0	85	100.0
All Centers	394	75.2	106	20.2	6	1.1	18	3.4	0	0.0	524	99.9

TABLE 2-7

Number of Rooms Per Household

Class VI

CENTER	NUMBER OF RESPONDING STUDENTS	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING	NUMBER FOR WHOM QUESTION NOT APPLICABLE
I	103	4.76	1.14	9	0
II	97	5.16	1.35	12	0
III	112	4.78	1.11	11	1
IV	49	5.06	1.09	45	0
V	57	6.03	1.69	23	5
ALL CENTERS	418	5.06	1.33	100	6

TABLE 2-8

Number of Persons in Household

Class VI

CENTER	NUMBER OF RESPONDING STUDENTS	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING	NUMBER FOR WHOM QUESTION NOT APPLICABLE
I	112	5.15	1.87	0	0
II	107	5.59	2.04	2	0
III	124	5.47	2.10	0	0
IV	94	5.23	2.08	0	0
V	80	5.37	1.64	0	5
ALL CENTERS	517	5.36	1.97	2	5

TABLE 2-9

Number of Persons Per Room in Household

Class VI

CENTER	NUMBER OF RESPONDING STUDENTS	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING	NUMBER FOR WHOM QUESTION NOT APPLICABLE
I	103	1.10	0.41	9	0
II	97	1.07	0.35	12	0
III	112	1.20	0.55	11	1
IV	49	0.94	0.35	45	0
V	57	0.93	0.29	23	5
ALL CENTERS	418	1.07	0.43	100	6

TABLE 2-10

Living Space

Class VI

Center	Number of Responding Students	Overcrowded Condition N	Overcrowded Condition %*	Not Overcrowded Condition N	Not Overcrowded Condition %	Number For Whom Question Applicable But Not Responding	Number For Whom Question Not Applicable
I	104	42	40.4	62	59.6	8	0
II	98	47	47.9	51	52.0	11	0
III	114	55	48.2	59	51.7	9	1
IV	54	17	31.5	37	68.5	40	0
V	58	19	32.7	39	67.2	22	5
All Centers	428	180	42.1	248	57.9	90	6

* Percentages are based on the number of responding students.

TABLE 2-11

Monthly Rent

Class VI

Center	Number of Responding Students	Mean	S.D.	Number Not Responding	Number for Whom Question Not Applicable
I	103	96.49	34.59	8	1
II	93	110.29	52.28	16	0
III	101	83.61	31.96	20	3
IV	77	119.71	38.73	15	2
V	66	132.18	39.33	13	6
All Centers	440	105.86	43.00	72	12

Table 2-12 shows the distribution of weekly take home income among Class VI families. This total weekly income figure includes parental salaries, contributions by other family members, pensions, state-aid and the like. The large standard deviations would indicate much variability in income within each Center. In addition there is great variation among the five Centers with regard to weekly income: the range is from $121.81 to $157.44. Center III families showed the lowest weekly income ($121.81) and Center V, the highest ($157.44). The mean family income of $136.25 per week supports families whose mean size is 5.36 members (Table 2-8). It is of interest to note that this provides $25.42 per family member per week as mean income. This weekly income figure has risen slowly each year since Class I (1965) when it was $18.61 per family member. Whether this dollar income increase represents an improvement in living or was consumed by inflation has not been investigated. An additional fact of interest which is not shown in the table is that 121 students, or 26.8% of the total number of responding students are members of families receiving welfare or Aid to Dependent Children.

Employment of Parents

Tables 2-13 and 2-14 contain information regarding the occupations of Class VI parents. Thirty-seven point six percent (197) of Class VI students report that their mothers work (Table 2-13). Eighteen point three percent are employed as office workers. Six point seven percent are employed in some kind of skilled labor. Another eight point two percent are employed as unskilled laborers. The 'not applicable' category containing 43.1% of Class VI

TABLE 2-12

Total Weekly Income

Class VI

Center	Number of Responding Students	Mean	S.D.	Number Not Responding	Number for whom Question Not Applicable
I	91	122.46	44.97	21	0
II	94	138.75	54.60	15	0
III	111	121.81	46.99	13	0
IV	81	149.00	62.59	13	0
V	75	157.44	66.43	6	4
All Centers	452	136.25	56.31	68	4

TABLE 2-13

Mother's Occupation

Class VI

Center	Professional		Office Worker		Sales		Managerial/ Proprietor		Civil Service Non-Office		Skilled Labor		Unskilled Labor		Disabled/ Retired		Other		No Information		Not Applicable		Total		Total Employed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	1	0.9	22	19.6	1	0.9	1	0.9	1	0.9	3	2.7	11	9.8	0	0.0	1	0.9	30	26.8	41	36.6	112	100.0	41	36.6
II	0	0.0	16	14.7	0	0.0	2	1.8	2	1.8	10	9.2	4	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	35	32.1	40	36.7	109	100.0	34	31.2
III	0	0.0	16	12.9	1	0.8	1	0.8	0	0.0	18	14.5	13	10.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	9.7	63	50.8	124	100.0	49	39.5
IV	4	4.3	28	29.8	1	1.1	0	0.0	1	1.1	2	2.1	5	5.3	0	0.0	1	1.1	12	12.8	40	42.5	94	100.0	42	44.7
V	2	2.3	14	16.5	0	0.0	3	3.5	0	0.0	2	2.3	10	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	14.1	42	49.4	85	99.9	31	36.5
All Centers	7	1.3	96	18.3	3	0.6	7	1.3	4	0.8	35	6.7	43	8.2	0	0.0	2	0.4	101	19.3	226	43.1	524	100.0	197	37.6

TABLE 2-14

Father's Occupation

Class VI

Center	Professional		Office Worker		Sales		Managerial/ Proprietor		Civil Service Non-Office		Skilled Labor		Unskilled Labor		Disabled/ Retired		Other		No Information		Not Applicable		Total		Total Employed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	1	0.9	5	4.5	1	0.9	5	4.5	8	7.1	25	22.3	8	7.1	0	0.0	3	2.7	49	43.7	7	6.3	112	100.0	56	50.0
II	8	7.3	2	1.8	0	0.0	7	6.4	4	3.7	32	29.4	13	11.9	1	0.9	0	0.0	37	33.9	5	4.6	109	99.9	66	60.5
III	2	1.6	11	8.9	3	2.4	13	10.5	[illegible]	5.6	29	23.4	22	17.7	2	1.6	2	1.6	24	19.3	9	7.3	124	99.9	89	71.8
IV	4	4.3	3	3.2	2	2.1	9	9.6	15	15.9	27	28.7	7	7.4	3	3.2	0	0.0	18	19.1	6	6.4	94	99.9	67	71.3
V	2	2.3	3	3.5	1	1.2	10	11.8	14	16.5	15	17.6	10	11.8	2	2.3	1	1.2	22	25.9	5	5.9	85	100.0	56	65.9
All Centers	17	3.2	24	4.6	7	1.3	44	8.4	48	9.2	128	24.4	60	11.5	8	1.5	6	1.1	150	28.6	32	6.1	524	99.9	334	63.7

mothers is composed largely of housewives.

Table 2-14 contains information regarding fathers' occupations. Sixty three point seven percent (334) of Class VI students report that their fathers work. About 24.4% of Class VI fathers are employed as skilled laborers. Eleven point five percent are employed as unskilled laborers. Nine point two percent are civil service non-office workers, 8.4% are in managerial positions or own their own businesses, and about 3.2% are professionals. It should be noted that 28.6% of Class VI students did not respond to this question. A large part of this unresponding group is composed of students who are living in households in which a father is not present. Thirty point five percent of Class VI reported mothers as head of household, 3.4% reported guardians and 0.9% reside in institutions (see Table 5).

Birthplace of Students and Parents

Tables 2-15, 2-16 and 2-17 contain information about the birthplace of Class VI students and their parents. A large majority (72.1%) of students were born in the Northern United States (Table 2-15). Approximately 7.8% were born in the Southern United States, 5.5% in Puerto Rico, 5.2% in the West Indies and 2.1% in the Far East. The picture is somewhat different for parents. Only 27.3% of mothers (Table 2-16) and 26.9% of fathers (Table 2-17) were born in the Northern United States, while 37.0% and 33.4%, respectively, were born in the South. An additional 18.3% of Class VI mothers were born in Puerto Rico. The corresponding figure for fathers is 17.9%. Approximately 33.2% of mothers and 33.9% of fathers were not born in the continental United States.

Language Most Spoken at Home

Information regarding the language most spoken in the homes of Class VI

TABLE 2-15

Student's Birthplace

Class VI

Center	U.S. North		U.S. South		Puerto Rico		West Indies		Far East		Other		No Information		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	80	71.4	6	5.3	12	10.7	6	5.4	0	0.0	5	4.5	3	2.7	112	100.0
II	69	63.3	14	12.8	4	3.7	6	5.5	0	0.0	9	8.3	7	6.4	109	100.0
III	76	61.3	10	8.1	10	8.1	12	9.7	11	8.9	4	3.2	1	0.8	124	100.1
IV	80	85.1	7	7.4	0	0.0	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	6.4	94	100.0
V	73	85.9	4	4.7	3	3.5	2	2.4	0	0.0	3	3.5	0	0.0	85	100.0
All Centers	378	72.1	41	7.8	29	5.5	27	5.2	11	2.1	21	4.0	17	3.2	524	99.9

TABLE 2-16

Mother's Birthplace

Class VI

Center	U.S. North		U.S. South		Puerto Rico		West Indies		Far East		Other		No Information		Question Not Applic.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	28	25.0	35	31.3	31	27.7	9	8.0	0	0.0	5	4.5	4	3.6	0	0.0	112	100.1
II	18	16.5	52	47.7	18	16.5	8	7.3	0	0.0	9	8.3	4	3.7	0	0.0	109	100.0
III	12	9.7	42	33.9	37	29.8	12	9.7	14	11.3	4	3.2	3	2.4	0	0.0	124	100.0
IV	36	38.3	49	52.1	3	3.2	3	3.2	0	0.0	2	2.1	1	1.1	0	0.0	94	100.0
V	49	57.6	16	18.8	7	8.2	5	5.9	0	0.0	7	8.2	1	1.2	0	0.0	85	99.9
All Centers	143	27.3	194	37.0	96	18.3	37	7.1	14	2.7	27	5.1	13	2.5	0	0.0	524	100.0

TABLE 2-17

Father's Birthplace

Class VI

Center	U.S. North		U.S. South		Puerto Rico		West Indies		Far East		Other		No Information		Question Not Applic.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	26	23.2	28	25.0	29	25.9	11	9.8	0	0.0	7	6.3	10	8.9	1	0.9	112	100.0
II	19	17.4	45	41.3	18	16.5	12	11.0	0	0.0	8	7.3	6	5.5	1	0.9	109	99.9
III	15	12.1	39	31.5	36	29.0	11	8.9	15	12.1	4	3.2	4	3.2	0	0.0	124	100.0
IV	30	31.9	48	51.1	3	3.2	4	4.3	0	0.0	5	5.3	4	4.3	0	0.0	94	100.1
V	51	60.0	15	17.6	8	9.4	4	4.7	0	0.0	3	3.5	4	4.7	0	0.0	85	99.9
All Centers	141	26.9	175	33.4	94	17.9	42	8.0	15	2.9	27	5.1	28	5.3	2	0.4	524	99.9

students is presented in Table 2-18. English is reported to be most spoken in 77.1% of Class VI households. Seventeen point five percent of students report Spanish as the language most spoken. French and Chinese are each spoken in a rather small percentage of Class VI students' homes.

Education of Parents

Tables 2-19 and 2-20 provide information regarding the level of schooling Class VI parents reached. Approximately 47.9% of Class VI fathers did not complete high school, while 34.3% did, but did not go on to college (Table 2-19). Four point two percent of fathers were graduated from college. The no information category of 13.5% is essentially composed of fathers who are no longer in the home. The corresponding percentages for mothers (Table 2-20) are 48.3% (non-high school graduates), 42.7% (high school graduates who did not go on to college) and 3.6% (college graduates). The 'no information' category of 5.3% is much lower than for fathers as most CDD students do live with their mothers and thus had this information available to them.

Years at Present Address

On the average Class VI students have lived at their present address approximately 6.77 years (Table 2-21), as of the time personal information forms were filled out. A standard deviation of 4.83 years, however, would indicate that there is considerable heterogeneity in regard to this measure of mobility for this group of students. The range is from 5.48 to 8.44 years. Center IV shows the lowest mobility, undoubtedly related to the 52% who own their own homes (see Table 2-6). (It is of interest to note Center IV data in Table 2-23 in this regard.)

Number of Schools Attended

Table 2-22 shows the number of schools Class VI students attended through their first nine years of school. Approximately 73.7% of this

TABLE 2-18

Language Most Spoken at Home

Class VI

Center	English		Spanish		French		Chinese		Other		No Information		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	82	73.2	26	23.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	3	2.7	112	100.0
II	83	76.1	20	18.3	2	1.8	0	0.0	1	0.9	3	2.8	109	99.9
III	72	58.1	35	28.2	0	0.0	12	9.7	5	4.0	0	0.0	124	100.0
IV	89	94.7	4	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1	94	100.1
V	78	91.8	7	8.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	85	100.0
All Centers	404	77.1	92	17.5	2	0.4	12	2.3	7	1.3	7	1.3	524	99.9

TABLE 2-19

Father's Education

Class VI

Center	Non High School Graduates		High School Graduates		College Graduates		No Information		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	57	50.9	31	27.7	3	2.7	21	18.7	112	100.0
II	58	53.2	30	27.5	5	4.6	16	14.7	109	100.0
III	65	52.4	39	31.5	6	4.8	14	11.3	124	100.0
IV	33	35.1	45	47.9	5	5.3	11	11.7	94	100.0
V	38	44.7	35	41.2	3	3.5	9	10.6	85	100.0
Total	251	47.9	180	34.3	22	4.2	71	13.5	524	99.9

TABLE 2-20

Mother's Education

Class VI

Center	Non High School Graduates		High School Graduates		College Graduates		No Information		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	62	55.4	44	39.3	2	1.8	4	3.6	112	100.1
II	62	56.9	39	35.8	3	2.7	5	4.6	109	100.0
III	73	58.9	41	33.1	1	0.8	9	7.3	124	100.1
IV	26	27.7	54	57.4	9	9.6	5	5.3	94	100.0
V	30	35.3	46	54.1	4	4.7	5	5.9	85	100.0
Total	253	48.3	224	42.7	19	3.6	28	5.3	524	99.9

TABLE 2-21

Years at Present Address

Class VI

CENTER	NUMBER OF RESPONDING STUDENTS	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING	NUMBER FOR WHOM QUESTION NOT APPLICABLE
I	107	5.48	4.24	5	0
II	103	5.83	4.40	6	0
III	123	7.75	5.24	1	0
IV	90	8.44	4.60	4	0
V	81	6.37	4.98	4	0
ALL CENTERS	504	6.77	4.83	20	0

TABLE 2-22

Number of Schools Attended Through First Nine Years of School

Class VI

Center	1 or More		2 or More		3 or More		4 or More		5 or More		No Inform.		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
I	110	98.2	108	96.4	88	78.6	49	43.7	23	20.5	2	1.8	112
II	106	97.2	105	96.3	81	74.3	44	40.4	28	25.7	3	2.8	109
III	123	99.2	115	92.7	67	54.0	29	23.3	9	7.3	1	0.8	124
IV	94	100.0	94	100.0	89	94.7	55	58.5	19	20.2	0	0.0	94
V	85	100.0	85	100.0	61	71.8	28	32.9	12	14.1	0	0.0	85
Total	518	98.9	507	96.7	386	73.7	205	39.1	91	17.3	6	1.1	524

population attended three or more schools, while 39.1% attended four or more. Center III seems to indicate the most stability in terms of this measure of mobility, while Center IV shows more than half (58.5%) of its students attending four or more schools. The high mean adjusted Life Chances Scale Score for this Center is consistent with the low mobility score (Table 2-23).

Adjusted Life Chances Scale Score

The adjusted Life Chances Scale Score is an attempt to integrate socio-economic information for each student into one measure indicating, in the absence of other information, his chances of success in high school. The scale is an adaptation of Dentler's original Life Chances Scale Score. Possible scores range from -2 to 9, with 9 representing the best chance of success in high school and -2, the worst. The following items are each given one point: both parents alive, both parents living together, father Northern born, mother Northern born, father professional, mother professional, father high school graduate, mother high school graduate, and less than four siblings. A value of -1 is given if living conditions are overcrowded or if the student and his family are receiving welfare or Aid to Dependent Children.

Table 2-23 shows the Life Chances Scale Score for Class VI students. The average score for all centers is 3.25. Centers IV and V are similar in this measure and,on the average, scored higher, while Centers I, II, and III, also similar in their scores, showed lower average scores.

Comparisons of the Five Centers on Socio-economic Data for Class VI

The means of the five Centers on each of the socio-economic measures were compared using a one-way analysis of variance technique. Significance

TABLE 2-23

Adjusted Life Chances Scale Score

Class VI

CENTER	NUMBER OF RESPONDING STUDENTS	MEAN	S.D.	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING	NUMBER FOR WHOM QUESTION NOT APPLICABLE
I	112	2.59	1.97	0	0
II	107	2.79	2.07	2	0
III	124	2.67	2.00	0	0
IV	94	4.44	2.03	0	0
V	85	4.27	2.37	0	0
ALL CENTERS	522	3.25	2.22	2	0

TABLE 2-24

Significance Levels Obtained from the Analyses of Variance Comparing Five Centers on Socio-economic Data for Class VI

Variable	Significance Level
Age in years	.01
Total Weekly income	.01
Monthly rent	.01
Number of rooms in apartment	.01
Number of persons in apartment	N.S.*
Number of persons per room in apartment	.01
Number of years at present address	.01
Adjusted Life Chances Scale Score	.01

*N.S. = Non-Significant (> .05)

levels are reported in Table 2-24. Significant variation between Centers was found for all variables except the number of persons in the home. (See Appendix A for analysis of variance summary tables.) An examination of the data showed that, in general, students in Centers IV and V were favored by a better socio-economic background. Students in these Centers came from families that were more intact and lived in conditions that were less crowded. On the average these parents had more education and higher incomes.

Previous Achievement

This section will describe the Class VI population with regard to their academic achievement prior to their entering the program. The following variables will be examined:

1. Seventh grade general average
2. Eighth grade general average
3. Mid-year ninth grade general average
4. Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) scores (reading and mathematics)
5. Number of days absent during the fall semester of the ninth year

Although some variation exists in the dates which Class VI students took the MAT, most students received reading scores in their mid-ninth grade and mathematics scores in their mid-eighth grade. This variation of dates should be kept in mind if the reader wishes to make appropriate comparisons between Class VI students' reading and mathematics ability at the time they applied to the program.

Tables 2-25, 2-26, and 2-27 present means and standard deviations of the 7th, 8th and mid-year 9th grade general averages of Class VI students. On the average, these students obtained about a 76 in their 7th and 8th grades

TABLE 2-25

Seventh Grade General Average

Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	96	16	74.57	11.11
II	100	9	75.44	8.56
III	103	21	78.08	7.56
IV	93	1	76.53	7.52
V	47	38	75.55	6.41
All Centers	439	85	76.11	8.63

?

TABLE 2-26

Eighth Grade General Average

Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	99	13	76.31	8.49
II	105	4	75.51	10.37
III	117	7	78.16	7.17
IV	93	1	75.87	7.35
V	50	35	75.32	6.66
All Centers	464	60	76.40	8.29

TABLE 2-27

Mid-Year Ninth Grade General Average

Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	109	3	76.63	9.29
II	107	2	75.35	9.57
III	124	0	77.01	6.22
IV	94	0	74.45	6.49
V	84	1	71.75	6.74
All Centers	518	6	75.27	8.01

and about a 75 in their mid-year 9th grade. Differences in standard deviations do exist between centers. The standard deviations range from 6.41 to 11.11. Additional information regarding mid-year 9th grade averages can be seen in Table 2-34. This two-way table of MAT reading averages and mid-year 9th grade averages can be used to provide frequency information on mid-ninth grade averages alone. Thus, although Class VI students on the average have mid-9th year averages of 75, Table 2-34 shows that 311 students had averages of 79 or below. This figure is conservative since Table 2-34 deals with only 458 students, those for whom we had both MAT reading and mid-year 9th grade averages.

The results of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests are found in Tables 2-28 through 2-32. Tables 2-28, 2-29 and 2-30 deal with reading, while Tables 2-31 through 2-33 provide information regarding the mathematical portion of the test. Nominating schools vary in the completeness with which they report MAT scores. Some report scores in parts with one of the parts occasionally missing, others report only an average. For these reasons, tables have been provided that take this difference into account. Thus Table 2-28 provides information regarding all students for whom we have paragraph meaning scores, Table 2-29 provides information regarding all students for whom we have vocabulary scores, and Table 2-30 provides information for students for whom only averages were reported as well as those for whom averages were computed by the CDD office when both part scores were available. The no information category in Table 2-30, containing 71 students, is comprised primarily of students whose reading scores came from other standardized tests and thus were excluded from Tables 2-28 through 2-30. A similar division is provided in Tables 2-31 through 2-33 which deal with mathematics, only here a total of

TABLE 2-28

Metropolitan Achievement Test:

Paragraph Meaning - Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	89	23	9.39	1.89
II	89	20	8.88	1.93
III	115	9	8.78	2.00
IV	84	10	9.74	1.49
V	40	45	8.88	1.67
All Centers	417	107	9.13	1.87

TABLE 2-29

Metropolitan Achievement Test;

Vocabulary - Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	88	24	9.47	2.01
II	89	20	9.37	1.75
III	113	11	9.21	1.98
IV	84	10	10.00	1.53
V	40	45	9.05	1.69
All Centers	414	110	9.44	1.84

TABLE 2-30

Metropolitan Achievement Test: Average of Paragraph Meaning and Vocabulary

Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	96	16	9.46	1.80
II	101	8	9.18	1.69
III	113	11	9.00	1.84
IV	87	7	9.88	1.40
V	56	29	9.11	1.56
All Centers	453	71	9.32	1.71

TABLE 2-31

Metropolitan Achievement Test:

Computation - Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	69	43	7.27	1.27
II	64	45	6.94	1.10
III	83	41	7.32	1.35
IV	59	35	8.08	1.48
V	36	49	7.52	1.34
All Centers	311	213	7.40	1.35

TABLE 2-32

Metropolitan Achievement Test: Problem Solving - Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	70	42	7.17	1.11
II	64	45	7.05	1.38
III	80	44	7.28	1.28
IV	60	34	7.89	1.51
V	36	49	7.58	1.13
All Centers	310	214	7.36	1.32

TABLE 2-33

Metropolitan Achievement Test: Average of Computation and Problem Solving

Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	78	34	7.27	1.10
II	68	41	7.06	1.22
III	86	38	7.25	1.23
IV	68	26	7.96	1.38
V	48	37	7.78	1.24
All Centers	348	176	7.43	1.27

176 students make up the no information category (Table 2-33). While many students' records presented scores from other standarized mathematics tests, these have been excluded from these tables as not comparable for analysis.

On the average, Class VI students were performing at about grade level in reading. The mean overall performance in reading (paragraph meaning and vocabulary combined) is 9.32 (Table 2-30). For mathematics, the overall mean score combining both problem solving and computation (Table 2-33) is 7.43, placing the average Class VI student about one year behind in mathematical ability. The two-way frequency distributions in Tables 2-34 and 2-35 provide additional information regarding MAT reading and mathematics scores. One hundred eighty-nine of the 458 (41.3%) are known to be reading below grade level, (8.9 or less) while 232 (65.4%) have mathematics scores that are below grade level (7.9 or less). Obviously these figures are neither mutually exclusive nor inclusive; a student may appear below level on reading, mathematics or both.

Tables 2-34 and 2-35 are two-way frequency distributions of mid-ninth grade general averages vs MAT Reading scores, and mid-ninth grade general averages vs MAT Mathematics scores, respectively. The reported number of students in each table (458 for reading and 355 for mathematics) represent those for whom the necessary pairs of scores were available and they are considered to be fairly representative samples of the entire Class VI population (524). Eighty-four point three percent of the sample either have mid-ninth year averages of 79 or below, or MAT Reading scores of 8.9 or below, or both (Table 2-34). As previously mentioned Class VI students generally took their MAT Reading Test in their mid-ninth grade, thus any

TABLE 2-34

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS READING AVERAGES AND MID-9TH GRADE GENERAL AVERAGES - CLASS VI

	≥10.0	9.0 - 9.9	8.0 - 8.9	7.0 - 7.9	6.0 - 6.9	≤5.9	Totals
≥85	20 (4.4)*	8 (1.7)	10 (2.2)	6 (1.3)	9 (2.0)	3 (0.7)	56 (12.3)
80 - 84	30 (6.5)	14 (3.1)	22 (4.8)	19 (4.1)	4 (0.9)	2 (0.4)	91 (19.8)
75 - 79	39 (8.5)	24 (5.2)	16 (3.5)	16 (3.5)	5 (1.1)	5 (1.1)	105 (22.9)
70 - 74	44 (9.6)	24 (5.2)	20 (4.4)	12 (2.6)	5 (1.1)	1 (0.2)	106 (23.1)
≤69	41 (8.9)	25 (5.5)	14 (3.1)	12 (2.6)	6 (1.3)	2 (0.4)	100 (21.8)
Totals	174 (37.9)	95 (20.7)	82 (18.0)	65 (14.1)	29 (6.4)	13 (2.8)	GRAND TOTAL 458

* Number in parentheses is percent of grand total

student with a score of 8.9 is considered to be at least six months below grade in reading. It should further be noted that 18.5% of this sample have mid-ninth year averages below 75 although reading at or above 10th grade level. Conversely 16.4% have mid-ninth year averages of 80 or above and are reading 8.9 or less. While the two groups may be qualitatively different populations in a number of ways, both types were accepted by the CDD staff as indicating unrealized potential on intake.

Table 2-35 presents a similar overview for mathematics achievement scores and mid-ninth grade general averages. Eighty-seven point zero percent of the sample have mid-ninth year averages of 79 or below, or mathematics scores of 7.9 or below, or both. The majority of Class VI students took the mathematics part of the MAT in their mid-eighth grade, thus a student scoring 7.9 is considered to be six months behind in mathematics. It may also be of interest that 18.6% of these students have averages of 80 or better while scoring 7.9 or less on the MAT mathematics part. Only two students (0.6%) of this sample have averages below 75 with scores of 10.0 or better in mathematics. In general Class VI students score higher on the Reading portion of the MAT tests than they do in mathematics.

Table 2-36 presents the average attendance of Class VI students in their first term of the ninth grade. On the average, Class VI students were absent 6.46 days with a standard deviation of 6.33.

Comparison of the Five Centers on Previous Achievement

To determine whether students of the five Centers differed significantly from each other with regard to the means of the above indicators of previous academic performance, a one-way analysis of variance was performed for each

TABLE 2-35

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
MATHEMATICS AVERAGES AND MID-9TH GRADE GENERAL AVERAGES - CLASS VI

	≥10.0	9.0 - 9.9	8.0 - 8.9	7.0 - 7.9	6.0 - 6.9	≤5.9	Totals
≥85	2 (0.6)*	5 (1.4)	8 (2.3)	7 (2.0)	10 (2.8)	6 (1.7)	38 (10.8)
80 - 84	5 (1.4)	6 (1.7)	20 (5.6)	18 (5.1)	15 (4.2)	10 (2.8)	74 (20.8)
75 - 79	2 (0.6)	10 (2.8)	15 (4.2)	22 (6.2)	24 (6.8)	9 (2.5)	82 (23.1)
70 - 74	2 (0.6)	6 (1.7)	21 (5.9)	27 (7.6)	23 (6.5)	7 (2.0)	86 (24.3)
≤69	0 (0.0)	2 (0.6)	19 (5.3)	23 (6.5)	22 (6.2)	9 (2.5)	75 (21.1)
Totals	11 (3.2)	29 (8.2)	83 (23.3)	97 (27.4)	94 (26.5)	41 (11.5)	GRAND TOTAL 355

*Number in parentheses is percent of grand total.

TABLE 2-36

Number of Days Absent
Fall Semester of Ninth Grade

Class VI

Center	N	No Information	Mean	S.D.
I	100	12	7.46	8.50
II	102	7	7.62	6.52
III	112	12	4.94	5.17
IV	78	16	6.47	5.32
V	80	5	5.85	4.72
All Centers	472	52	6.46	6.33

TABLE 2-37

Significance Levels Obtained from the Analyses of Variance Comparing Five Centers on Previous Achievement and Attendance

Class VI

Variable	Significance Level
Seventh Grade General Average	.05
Eighth Grade General Average	N.S.*
Mid-Year Ninth Grade General Average	.01
Metropolitan Achievement Tests	
Reading: Vocabulary	.05
Reading: Paragraph Meaning	.01
Reading: Average	.01
Math: Problem Solving	.01
Math: Computation	.01
Math: Average	.01
Ninth Year Absences (Fall Semester)	.05

*N.S. = Non-Significant ($>.05$)

indicator, using Centers as the independent variable. The results are shown in Table 2-37. Significant variation between Centers was demonstrated for all variables except for mid-year 8th grade general average. (See Appendix A for analysis of variance summary tables.)

Retention

It is possible at this time to provide a complete picture of the first year Class VI students spent in the College Discovery and Development Program with regard to retention. This data is provided in Tables 2-38 and 2-39. Table 2-38 takes the original enrollment of 524 students and shows the various kinds of changes the population underwent resulting in a final enrollment of 469. All changes are accounted for. The first column lists the original enrollment for each Center (those students who were expected to be present the first day of school). The second category of "No Shows" are those students who never actually participated in the program. The "Drops" category is composed of students who were dropped from the program as well as students who chose to leave. (For a more detailed analysis of why students leave the CDD Program, see Table 2-39.) Students may also be admitted beyond the September 1970 date (late admission). Some students were transferred within the program to other Centers and a few were re-admitted after they had left.

Eighty-two (4 + 78) students, 15.6% of the original 524 students, left the program. (An additional four students who were admitted late are also no longer part of the College Discovery program). Thus after the first year in the College Discovery and Development Program the retention rate for Class VI students is 84.5%.

Table 2-39 outlines the various reasons Class VI students left the program. The category of "Course Work" refers to students who decided on

TABLE 2-38

Retention Data

Class VI

Center	Original Enrollment 9/70	No Shows	Drops	Late Admits	Drops, Late Admits	Trans. In	Trans. Out	Re-Admits	June 1971 or Sept. 1971 *
I	112	0	14	12	0	1	0	0	111
II	109	2	34	16	4	0	1	0	84
III	124	1	11	1	0	0	0	1	114
IV	94	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	85
V	85	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	75
All Centers	524	4	78	29	4	1	1	2	469

*Enrollment at the end of June and the start of school in September is considered the same. Summer drops are officially dropped September 30th.

TABLE 2-39

Reasons for Dropping

Class VI

Center	Truancy & Academic Failure	Transferred to Another High School				No Reason	Medical	Work	No Shows	Total
		Course Work	Distance	Parent's Request	Moved Out Of State					
I	5	1	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	14
II	15	2	3	3	5	0	4	1	3	36
III	4	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	12
IV	3	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	9
V	0	0	0	7	2	1	0	1	0	11
ALL CENTERS	27 (32.9)	8 (9.8)	3 (3.7)	11 (13.4)	12 (14.6)	11 (13.4)				
	72 (87.8)						4 (4.9)	2 (2.4)	4 (4.9)	82

a line of study not offered at the CDD Center to which they were assigned. Thus 27 students, 32.9% of the 82 "Drops", or 5.1% of the entire population, left the program because of truancy or academic failure. It should further be noted that of these 82 drops 87.8% are known to continue in high school as of this date.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the sixth entering population of the College Discovery and Development Program. Special emphasis was given to socio-economic background and to the academic ability of each student prior to entering the program. The following socio-economic variables were used: sex, ethnicity, age, family structure, living conditions, economic data, employment and education of parents, years at present address, number of schools attended and the Dentler Life Chances Scale Score. The following academic measures were used: 7th, 8th, and mid-year 9th grade general averages, Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading and Mathematics scores, and the number of days absent during the fall semester of the ninth year. All of the preceding data were obtained from Personal Information Forms and Nomination Forms filled out by the candidate and the nominating counselor, respectively.

A final third section provided an overview of Class VI in regard to retention data. The retention rate for Class VI students after one year in the CDD program is 84.5%. Once again 87.8% of all those students who left the program are known to be in high school as of this date.

Means and standard deviations on socio-economic and academic measures for all Centers combined is provided in Table 2-40. All socio-economic variables for which frequency counts were used have been omitted from the table. In regard to those remaining variables the reader is referred to preceding tables. As can be seen in Table 2-40, the average Class VI student is about 15 years old. He comes from a family of about five members. He lives in a dwelling composed of approximately five rooms with rent over $100 per month. His Life Chances Scale Score is 3.25. In addition his 7th, 8th and mid-year 9th grade general averages were, on the average, in the mid-70s. He scored at about grade level on the MAT Reading and about one year below grade level on the MAT Mathematics.

The large standard deviation for most of these variables, however, would indicate that Class VI students vary considerably in terms of the socio-economic and academic variables used.

TABLE 2-40

Means and Standard Deviation for All Centers Combined on Socio-economic and Academic Measures

Class VI

VARIABLE Socio-economic	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	523	15.38	0.54
No. of Rooms per Household	418	5.06	1.33
No. of Persons per Household	517	5.36	1.97
No. of Persons per Room per Household	418	1.07	0.43
Monthly Rent	440	105.86	43.00
Total Weekly Income	452	136.25	56.31
Years at Present Address	504	6.77	4.83
Adjusted Life Chances Scale Score	522	3.25	2.22
Academic			
7th Grade General Average	439	76.11	8.63
8th Grade General Average	464	76.40	8.29
Mid-Year 9th Grade General Average	518	75.27	8.01
MAT Reading:			
Paragraph Meaning	417	9.13	1.87
Vocabulary	414	9.44	1.84
MAT Mathematics:			
Comprehensive	311	7.40	1.35
Problem Solving	310	7.36	1.32
No. of Days Absent:			
Fall Semester - 9th Grade	472	6.46	6.33

CHAPTER 3

ATTENDANCE AND ACHIEVEMENT

ALL CLASSES

(1970-1971)

This chapter presents data on academic performance and attendance for Classes IV, V and VI. No data on Control students are presented because Control III, the last such group to be selected, was graduated in June 1970. The reasons for discontinuing the selection of Control students are presented in a previous report.[1]

Comparisons will be made between Centers within each Class using F tests (analyses of variance). The power of some of these comparisons is low because of the small numbers of students involved and the large variability of scores within the Centers: in these instances, if differences exist between the population means, the probability of detecting them using an F test is small.

---

[1] Beatrice Harris and Lawrence Brody, Discovering and Developing the College Potential of Disadvantaged High School Youth: A Report of the Fourth Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program, Office of Research and Evaluation, City University of New York, June, 1970, p. 48.

Fall Semester

Class IV

Data on fall semester general averages for Class IV students (seniors) are presented in Table 3-1. The means ranged from 65.59 to 72.38. For all Centers combined the mean general average was 69.50.

Performance data for the four year English regents are presented in Table 3-2. The means ranged from 56.37 to 74.00; the combined mean for all Centers was 62.35.

Performance data on the Class IV math regents are presented in Table 3-3 in which means ranged from 33.67 to 47.08. The combined mean for all the Centers was 39.93.

Attendance data for Class IV students for the fall semester are presented in Table 3-4. The mean number of days absent for Class IV ranged from 7.04 to 12.12, with a mean across Centers of 9.81. There was considerable variability in attendance within the various Centers.

Class V

Table 3-5 presents means and standard deviations of general averages for Class V students (juniors). The means ranged from 68.16 to 75.64, with a combined mean across all Centers of 71.75.

Table 3-6 presents performance data on the fall mathematics regents examinations for Class V. The means ranged from 35.08 to 54.56, with an average across Centers of 45.78.

Data on number of days absent for Class V students are presented in Table 3-7. The means ranged from 5.97 to 10.13. For all Centers combined the mean was 8.00; the variability within the individual Centers was high.

TABLE 3-1

Fall Semester

General Average

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	82	65.59	15.21
II	71	69.80	11.22
III	80	70.07	12.98
IV	63	72.38	10.35
V	74	70.47	7.33
All Centers	370	69.50	12.02

TABLE 3-2

Fall Semester

English Regents

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	41	61.95	10.69
II	58	63.26	10.30
III	8	56.37	5.68
IV	-	-	-
V	1	74.00	-
All Centers	108	62.35	10.28

TABLE 3-3

Fall Semester

Math Regents

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	13	39.00	12.71
II	30	37.90	14.51
III	15	33.67	16.50
IV	14	39.57	10.80
V	24	47.08	21.57
All Centers	96	39.93	16.55

TABLE 3-4

Fall Semester

Absences

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	83	12.12	11.09
II	71	10.32	8.80
III	80	9.50	10.21
IV	62	9.77	6.13
V	73	7.04	6.20
All Centers	369	9.81	9.00

TABLE 3-5

Fall Semester

General Average

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	116	68.16	15.65
II	101	72.36	9.10
III	82	71.29	11.20
IV	97	75.64	6.75
V	83	71.96	9.27
All Centers	479	71.75	11.30

TABLE 3-6

Fall Semester

Math Regents

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	24	49.54	13.37
II	22	36.05	15.36
III	12	35.08	17.98
IV	11	48.73	17.41
V	25	54.56	19.26
All Centers	94	45.78	18.07

TABLE 3-7

Fall Semester

Absences

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	116	10.13	13.29
II	101	8.69	7.90
III	82	8.27	8.77
IV	97	6.26	3.93
V	83	5.97	5.96
All Centers	479	8.00	8.96

TABLE 3-8

Fall Semester

General Average

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	111	70.98	12.87
II	110	69.06	12.07
III	120	75.79	9.62
IV	93	71.37	7.64
V	85	70.20	10.21
All Centers	519	71.63	10.97

Class VI

Data on general averages for Class VI students (sophomores) are presented in Table 3-8 and the means varied from 69.06 to 75.79. The combined mean across Centers was 71.63.

Performance data on the Math Regents for Class VI is presented in Table 3-9. The means ranged from 37.77 to 56.92, with a combined mean across Centers of 50.25.

Table 3-10 furnishes information about the attendance of Class VI students. The mean number of days absent for the various Centers ranged from 6.09 to 8.89. The combined mean for all Centers was 7.58. The variability within the Centers was high.

Comparisons Between Centers

A one-way analysis of variance with Centers as the independent variable was performed on each of the fall semester academic performance and attendance variables (except for the Class IV English regents, which was omitted because of the very small number of candidates in some of the Centers). These analyses were done to see whether the differences among the means of the Centers could have occurred by chance. Table 3-11 presents the results of these analyses. All comparisons resulted in significant F ratios, except for the Class IV mathematics regents. This indicates that for the variables with significant F ratios, it is very unlikely that the differences among the means of the Centers occurred by chance. We conclude, therefore, that inter-Center differences in mean performance do exist. (Analysis of variance summary tables for each variable are contained in Appendix B.)

TABLE 3-9

Fall Semester

Math Regents

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	25	56.92	18.75
II	13	37.77	24.14
III	22	46.23	22.94
IV	42	53.33	12.51
V	8	44.63	16.74
All Centers	110	50.25	18.92

TABLE 3-10

Fall Semester

Absences

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	111	7.70	10.26
II	109	8.89	9.52
III	120	7.27	8.33
IV	93	6.09	4.39
V	85	7.82	8.10
All Centers	518	7.58	8.50

TABLE 3-11

Significance Levels Obtained From the Analyses of Variance Comparing Five Centers on Fall Semester Academic Performance and Attendance: Classes IV, V and VI.

Variable	Significance Level
Class IV	
General Average	.05
Mathematics Regents	N.S.*
Fall Absences	.05
Class V	
General Average	.01
Mathematics Regents	.01
Fall Absences	.01
Class VI	
General Average	.01
Mathematics Regents	.05
Fall Absences	.01

* non-significant ($p > .05$)

Spring Semester

Class IV

The general averages for Class IV students in the spring semester are presented in Table 3-12. The means ranged from 66.74 to 77.46. The combined mean for all Centers was 71.63.

Performance of Class IV students on the English regents examination is presented in Table 3-13. The means ranged from 63.28 to 71.80 and the mean for all Centers combined was 66.76.

The performance of Class IV students on the senior year social studies regents examination is shown in Table 3-14. The means for Class IV students ranged from 71.07 to 76.59, with a combined mean across Centers of 74.35.

The performance of Class IV students on the senior year math regents examination is shown in Table 3-15 where the means ranged from 26.13 to 59.60. In all Centers combined the mean was 53.03.

Table 3-16 presents the performance of Class IV students on the science regents examinations. The means for CDD IV students ranged from 53.36 to 73.48. For all Centers combined, the mean was 62.56.

Table 3-17 presents the performance of Class IV students on the foreign language regents. The means for Class IV students range from 63.14 to 78.75, with a combined mean across Centers of 66.04.

Data on spring semester absences for Class IV students are presented in Table 3-18. The means for Class IV students ranged from 7.71 to 15.96. For all Centers combined the mean was 13.21. The variability within the Centers was extensive.

TABLE 3-12

Spring Semester

General Average

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	74	66.74	13.32
II	65	75.97	10.59
III	71	69.06	13.35
IV	52	77.46	7.06
V	72	71.04	7.33
All Centers	334	71.63	11.52

TABLE 3-13

Spring Semester

English Regents

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	25	63.28	9.40
II	31	63.61	9.34
III	54	65.96	8.07
IV	50	71.80	6.18
V	70	66.40	7.54
All Centers	230	66.76	8.33

TABLE 3-14

Spring Semester

History Regents

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	56	71.07	10.12
II	58	76.48	12.43
III	57	73.17	7.92
IV	36	73.67	7.17
V	68	76.59	9.36
All Centers	275	74.35	9.91

TABLE 3-15

Spring Semester

Math Regents

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	26	56.65	15.52
II	24	57.63	13.77
III	21	48.86	20.12
IV	15	59.60	9.06
V	8	26.13	21.35
All Centers	94	53.03	18.10

TABLE 3-16

Spring Semester

Science Regents

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	18	59.72	8.73
II	11	53.36	12.83
III	24	55.83	11.24
IV	25	73.48	12.66
V	24	64.25	10.77
All Centers	102	62.56	13.19

TABLE 3-17

Spring Semester

Foreign Language Regents

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	8	63.63	19.14
II	18	65.33	18.75
III	13	72.38	14.79
IV	4	78.75	10.24
V	35	63.14	11.02
All Centers	78	66.04	14.91

TABLE 3-18

Spring Semester

Absences

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	73	15.96	13.26
II	64	12.41	10.07
III	52	10.98	10.78
IV	28	7.71	5.16
V	71	14.91	7.32
All Centers	288	13.21	10.45

TABLE 3-19

Total Absences

1970-71

Class IV

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	72	27.36	20.77
II	60	21.13	14.99
III	47	19.13	15.95
IV	28	15.21	9.27
V	71	21.56	11.94
All Centers	278	21.92	16.09

Table 3-19 presents data on the total absences of Class IV students for the academic year 1970-1971. The mean number of days absent ranged from 15.21 to 27.36. For all Centers combined the mean was 21.92. The variability within the Centers was high.

Class V

Table 3-20 presents the data on general averages for Class V students. The Center means ranged from 68.94 to 75.99. For all Centers combined the mean general average was 70.79.

The performance of Class V students on the spring math regents examinations is presented in Table 3-21. Means ranged from 51.37 to 64.41. For all Centers combined the mean math regents score was 58.49.

Table 3-22 presents data on the performance of Class V students on the spring semester science regents examinations in which the means for the Centers ranged from 52.97 to 76.10. The combined mean score for all Centers was 60.17.

Table 3-23 presents the data on the foreign language regents examinations for Class V students. The means range from 58.94 to 72.45. For all Centers combined the mean score was 67.76.

Data on absences for the spring semester for Class V students are presented in Table 3-24. Means varied from 6.81 to 13.13. Variability within the Centers was high. For all Centers combined the average number of days absent was 10.93.

Data on total absences of Class V students for the academic year 1970-1971 are presented in Table 3-25. The means for the various Centers ranged from 12.89 to 20.51. For all Centers combined the mean was 17.75. Variability within the individual Centers was high.

TABLE 3-20

Spring Semester

General Average

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	110	68.94	14.25
II	100	69.73	11.19
III	74	69.15	11.06
IV	93	75.99	6.63
V	79	70.14	9.93
All Centers	456	70.79	11.33

TABLE 3-21

Spring Semester

Math Regents

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	49	63.65	17.60
II	48	51.37	21.97
III	58	53.00	20.97
IV	71	64.41	12.83
V	28	58.03	22.50
All Centers	254	58.49	19.46

TABLE 3-22

Spring Semester

Science Regents

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	69	57.94	12.31
II	55	58.78	13.22
III	62	52.97	13.50
IV	41	76.10	6.80
V	65	60.54	12.73
All Centers	292	60.17	14.02

TABLE 3-23

Spring Semester

Foreign Language Regents

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	33	72.45	17.03
II	45	69.18	14.91
III	44	69.29	18.12
IV	49	71.27	10.70
V	52	58.94	16.72
All Centers	223	67.76	16.23

TABLE 3-24

Spring Semester

Absences

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	106	11.35	12.43
II	100	13.13	13.09
III	74	10.20	9.92
IV	91	6.81	4.63
V	77	13.05	9.81
All Centers	448	10.93	10.79

TABLE 3-25

Total Absences 1970-71

Class V

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	106	18.78	17.93
II	95	20.51	16.59
III	74	17.36	16.71
IV	91	12.89	7.71
V	77	19.04	14.21
All Centers	443	17.75	15.33

Class VI

Mean general averages of Class VI students in the spring semester are presented in Table 3-26. Means ranged from 68.41 to 73.03. For all Centers combined the mean general average was 70.22.

Table 3-27 presents data on the performance of Class VI students on the spring math regents examinations. Center means ranged from 50.05 to 66.75. For all Centers combined the mean score was 57.97.

Data on the performance of Class VI students on the spring science regents examinations are presented in Table 3-28. The means varied from 56.54 to 72.06 and the average score for all Centers combined was 63.85.

Table 3-29 presents data on the performance of Class VI students on the spring foreign language regents examinations. Center means ranged from 54.77 to 80.09. The average score for all Centers was 69.39.

The number of days absent during the spring semester for Class VI students is presented in Table 3-30. The means for the various Centers ranged from 7.18 to 12.30. For all Centers combined the mean number of days absent was 10.23. Considerable variability in the number of days absent was apparent for all Centers.

Table 3-31 presents the means and standard deviations for the total number of days Class VI students were absent during the school year 1970-1971. The means for the Centers varied from 12.95 to 19.26. For all Centers combined the mean number of days absent was 16.89. Variability within the Centers was high.

TABLE 3-26

Spring Semester

General Average

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	111	69.33	14.55
II	87	68.91	11.89
III	118	71.20	14.57
IV	84	73.03	6.73
V	77	68.41	8.57
All Centers	477	70.22	12.20

TABLE 3-27

Spring Semester

Math Regents

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	36	66.75	18.11
II	61	50.05	23.61
III	93	58.52	23.52
IV	48	63.39	13.90
V	41	54.49	20.88
All Centers	279	57.97	21.70

TABLE 3-28

Spring Semester

Science Regents

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	84	61.99	11.43
II	69	56.54	14.61
III	107	67.58	13.40
IV	84	72.06	8.86
V	69	57.67	12.15
All Centers	413	63.85	13.47

TABLE 3-29

Spring Semester

Foreign Language Regents

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	46	80.09	15.94
II	34	66.73	22.09
III	65	74.43	20.35
IV	65	68.05	10.90
V	44	54.77	17.98
All Centers	254	69.39	19.09

TABLE 3-30

Spring Semester

Absences

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	108	11.93	13.11
II	87	9.91	10.40
III	112	9.72	11.14
IV	85	7.18	4.84
V	77	12.30	7.65
All Centers	469	10.23	10.27

TABLE 3-31

Total Absences

1970-71

Class VI

Center	N	Mean	S.D.
I	102	18.77	19.32
II	84	17.30	15.34
III	112	16.22	15.87
IV	85	12.95	7.92
V	77	19.26	13.20
All Centers	460	16.89	15.19

Comparisons Between Centers

A one-way analysis of variance, with Centers as the independent variable, was performed on each of the spring semester academic performance and attendance variables. These analyses were done to see whether the differences among the means of the Centers could have occurred by chance. Table 3-32 presents the results of these analyses. All comparisons resulted in significant F ratios except for the Class IV foreign language regents and Class VI general average. We conclude, therefore, that for those variables with significant F ratios, inter-Center differences in mean performance do exist. Analysis of variance summary tables for each variable are contained in Appendix B.

Summary

This chapter has presented data on the academic performance and attendance of Classes IV, V and VI during the school year 1970-71. The means and standard deviations of each variable were given for each Center separately and for all Centers combined. Table 3-33 (fall semester) and Table 3-34 (spring semester) summarize the data in this chapter by presenting, for each variable, the means and standard deviations for all Centers combined.

TABLE 3-32

Significance Levels Obtained From the Analyses of Variance Comparing Five Centers on Spring Semester Academic Performance and Attendance: Classes IV, V and VI

Variable	Significance Level
Class IV	
General Average	.01
English Regents	.01
History Regents	.01
Mathematics Regents	.01
Science Regents	.01
Foreign Language Regents	N.S.*
Spring Absences	.01
Total Absences (1970-71)	.01
Class V	
General Average	.01
Mathematics Regents	.01
Science Regents	.01
Foreign Language Regents	.01
Spring Absences	.01
Total Absences (1970-71)	.01
Class VI	
General Average	N.S.*
Mathematics Regents	.01
Science Regents	.01
Foreign Language Regents	.01
Spring Absences	.01
Total Absences (1970-71)	.05

* non-significant ($p > .05$)

TABLE 3-33

Summary of Fall Semester Academic Performance and Attendance: (All Centers Combined)

Classes IV, V and VI

Class	Variable	N	Mean	S.D.
IV	General Average	370	69.50	12.02
	English Regents	108	62.35	10.28
	Math Regents	96	39.93	16.55
	Absences	369	9.81	9.00
V	General Average	479	71.75	11.30
	Math Regents	94	45.78	18.07
	Absences	479	8.00	8.96
VI	General Average	519	71.63	10.97
	Math Regents	110	50.25	18.92
	Absences	518	7.58	8.50

TABLE 3-34

Summary of Spring Semester Academic Performance and Attendance: (All Centers Combined)

Classes IV, V, and VI

Class	Variable	N	Mean	S.D.
IV	General Average	334	71.63	11.52
	English Regents	230	66.76	8.33
	History Regents	275	74.35	9.91
	Math Regents	94	53.03	18.10
	Science Regents	102	62.56	13.19
	Foreign Language Regents	78	66.04	14.91
	Spring Absences	288	13.21	10.45
	Total Absences	278	21.92	16.09
V	General Average	456	70.79	11.33
	Math Regents	254	58.49	19.46
	Science Regents	292	60.17	14.02
	Foreign Language Regents	223	67.76	16.23
	Spring Absences	448	10.93	10.79
	Total Absences	443	17.75	15.33
VI	General Average	477	70.22	12.20
	Math Regents	279	57.97	21.70
	Science Regents	413	63.85	13.47
	Foreign Language Regents	254	69.39	19.09
	Spring Absences	469	10.23	10.27
	Total Absences	460	16.89	15.19

CHAPTER 4

COLLEGE PROGRESS OF CDD STUDENTS IN CLASSES I, II AND III

In September 1965, implementation of the College Discovery and Development Program began with the enrollment of 529 students in the tenth grade. One of the major goals of the program has been to recognize students with high potential and, through implementation of various aspects of the program, to improve their chances of college success. The study reported here is one of a series undertaken to secure a picture of the college progress of College Discovery and Development students.

As of September 1971, Class I, the first students in the College Discovery and Development Program, had completed three years of college. The second group, Class II, had completed two years of college and Class III had completed one year of college and Class IV, enrolled in the tenth grade in September 1968, had just started college.

During the fall of 1971, college transcripts were collected for all Class I, Class II and Class III students who could be located. The performance and status of these students is summarized in this Chapter in terms of the following measures: enrollment by semester, graduation rate, grade point average (GPA), and number of credits each student had attempted, earned, failed, passed, left incomplete, or from which he withdrew. Information concerning these measures is presented by semester.

In completing grade point averages, all grades were converted to numerical equivalents as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

For every criterion based upon credits attempted (credits earned, passed, failed, left incomplete, and withdrawn from) three measures were calculated: the mean (or average number per person), the standard deviation, and a percentage based on the mean number of credits attempted.

The N's reported in this study for each CDD class are somewhat smaller than the total of all CDD students enrolled in college. There are a number of reasons for this. Often a student's written consent was required by the college before they would release his transcript and in many cases college addresses were difficult to obtain; thus transcript release authorization was not received. In other cases, the College Discovery and Development Program had lost contact for a variety of reasons with students who had moved to different colleges. Difficulties involved in the collection and coding of college performance data from some of the private colleges further reduced the number of CDD graduates whose data could be used in this study. For these and other reasons, a decision was made to report only enrollment figures for CDD graduates in private and SUNY colleges. For those CDD graduates who entered The City University of New York, complete performance data is reported where available.

College Status of CDD Students Attending The City University of New York

Tables 4-1 through 4-6 present data on the college status of Classes I, II and III, based on transcripts received prior to February 1972. The reader should keep in mind that the acquisition of new data will result in increased frequencies in some of the cells of the tables. Note also that data from private and SUNY colleges are not included in these tables but were included in the Fifth Annual Report (1969-70).

Of the 206 Class I students who entered the City University in September 1968, 167 (81.1%) enrolled in community colleges (Table 4-1). After six semesters, 37 are known to have graduated with Associate of Arts degrees and 12 students were enrolled for a seventh semester.

Thirty-nine Class I students (18.9% of 206) enrolled in September 1968 for their first semester in a senior college (Table 4-2). At the start of the seventh semester, 38 students were enrolled.[1] Class I students who dropped out of the senior colleges were approximately equal in number to those Class I community college students who received their Associate of Arts degrees and then went on to enroll in a senior college of CUNY.

One hundred forty-six of the 164 Class I enrollees in CUNY (89.0%) entered community colleges in September, 1969 (Table 4-3). After four semesters, fifteen students had graduated with associate degrees and 59 enrolled for a fifth semester.

Class II initial enrollees in senior colleges of CUNY numbered 18 (11.0% of 164) (Table 4-4). Twenty students enrolled for their fifth semester in September, 1971, including four students who transferred into senior colleges that semester.

Fifty-seven of the 127 Class III students (46.3%) who enrolled in CUNY started their first semester of community college in September 1970 (Table 4-5). By September 1971, 37 students were enrolled for a third semester.

Table 4-6 shows the college progress of Class III senior college students. Sixty-six students (53.7% of 127) enrolled for their first semester in September, 1970. September of the following year showed 50 students enrolled for a third semester.

---

[1] Frequencies in semester 7 of Table 4-1 are given only for those categories that resulted in students enrolling for that semester. Frequencies in semester 7 for categories that involve leaving college (drops, transfers out, graduation etc.) will be given in the 7th annual report. The same principle holds for semester 7, Table 4-2, semester 5 in Tables 4-3 and 4-4, and semester 3 in Tables 4-5 and 4-6.

Table 4-1

Status of Class I Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Community Colleges

	SEMESTERS							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total College Graduates
Initial Enrollees	167							
Re-enrolless from Previous Semester		155	133	109	67	35	12	
Late Entries				1				
Re-Entries		1		1				
Drops	12	21	25	29	14	11		
Leaves of Absence				2	1			
Transfers Out to CUNY		1			2	2		
Transfers Out to Other Institutions					1			
Graduates with Associate Degrees (Not Re-Enrolled) in CUNY 4-yr. colleges)				5	8	5		18
Graduates with Associate Degrees (Re-Enrolled in CUNY 4-yr. colleges)				4	6	5		15
Graduates with Associate Degrees (Re-Enrolled in non-CUNY 4-yr. Colleges)				3	1			4
TOTAL COLLEGE GRADUATES				12	15	10		37

Table 4-2

Status of Class I Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Senior Colleges

	SEMESTERS						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Initial Enrollees	39						
Re-Enrollees from Previous Semester		34	31	31	30	33	38
Late Entries							
Re-Entries			1		1		
Transfers In from CUNY						1	
Transfers In from Other Institutions							
Graduated in: From 2-yr. CUNY					4	6	5
Drops	5	3	1		2	2	
Leaves of Absence				1			
Transfers Out: To CUNY							
Transfers Out: To Other Institutions							

Table 4-3

Status of Class II Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Community Colleges

	SEMESTERS				
	1	2	3	4	5
Initial Enrollees	146				
Re-enrollees from Previous Semester		125	98	91	59
Late Entries		2	1		
Re-Entries					
Drops	21	29	8	15	
Leaves of Absence					
Transfers Out to CUNY				2	
Transfers Out to Other Institutions					
Graduates with Associate Degrees (Not Re-Enrolled in CUNY 4-yr. colleges)				10	
Graduates with Associate Degrees (Re-Enrolled in CUNY 4-yr. colleges)				3	
Graduates with Associate Degrees (Re-Enrolled in non-CUNY 4 yr. Colleges)				2	
TOTAL COLLEGE GRADUATES				15	

Table 4-4

Status of Class II Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Senior Colleges

SEMESTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
Initial Enrollees	18				
Re-Enrollees from Previous Semester		17	18	18	16
Late Entries					
Re-Entries					
Transfers In from CUNY		1			2
Transfers In from Other Institutions					3
Graduated in: From 2 yr. CUNY					
Drops				2	
Leaves of Absence					
Transfers Out: To CUNY	1				
Transfers Out: To Other Institutions					

Table 4-5

Status of Class III Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Community Colleges

	SEMESTERS 1	2	3
Initial Enrollees	57		
Re-Enrollees from Previous Semester		53	57
Late Entries			
Re-Entries		1	
Drops	4	17	
Leaves of Absence			
Transfers Out to CUNY			
Transfers Out to Other Institutions			

Table 4-6

Status of Class III Graduates Enrolled in CUNY Senior Colleges

	SEMESTERS 1	2	3
Initial Enrollees	66		
Re-Enrollees from Previous Semester		58	50
Late Entries			
Re-Entries			
Transfers In from CUNY			
Transfers In from Other Institutions			
Graduated in: From 2-yr. CUNY			
Drops	8	8	
Leaves of Absence			
Transfers Out: To CUNY			
Transfers Out: To Other Institutions			

In an attempt to make these figures more meaningful to the reader we have decided to make several comparisons between the CDD populations now in college and the open-admissions population which has completed its first year at The City University of New York (Table 4-7). The limits of currently available data concerning the open-admissions population enable us to make only comparisons concerning the first semester and first year of college academic performance.

The percentage of open-admissions day freshmen who dropped out of City University's senior colleges after the first semester was 12.4 percent. The drop-out rate for those freshmen who qualified for senior colleges without the open-admissions policy was 6.5%.[1] The corresponding figures for CDD Classes I, II, and III are 12.8 percent, 0.0 percent, and 12.1 percent, respectively.

The percentage of open-admissions freshmen who dropped out of the community colleges after the first semester was 21.6. The corresponding drop-out rate for regular freshmen in the community colleges was 16.8%.[2] This compares with 7.2 percent for CDD Class I, 14.4 percent for CDD Class II and 7.0 percent for CDD Class III.

After the first year, the senior colleges lost 29.6 percent of the open-admissions students and 13.6 percent of the regular freshmen.[3] After the first year, Class I lost 20.5 percent of the students in the senior colleges, Class II lost 5.5 percent and Class III lost 24.2 percent.

---

[1] As reported in The New York Times, Sept. 12, 1971

[2] Ibid.

[3] As reported in The New York Times Nov. 18, 1971

Table 4-7

Percentage of Classes I, II and III Students Enrolled
After One Semester and One Year of College Work Compared
With Open-Admissions Students and Regular Freshmen

	FIRST SEMESTER					FIRST YEAR				
	Open Admission Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	CDD Classes			Open Admission Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	CDD Classes		
			I	II	III			I	II	III
Senior College	12.4	6.5	12.8	5.5	12.1	29.6	13.6	20.5	5.5	24.2
			(39)*	(18)	(66)			(39)	(18)	(66)
Community College	21.6	16.8	7.2	14.4	7.0	40.1	34.4	20.3	34.2	29.8
			(167)	(146)	(57)			(167)	(146)	(57)

*The numbers in parentheses are the initial enrollments, the bases of the corresponding percentages.

The community colleges after the first year lost 40.1 percent of the open-admissions students and 34.4 percent of the regular freshmen.[4] The corresponding figures for CDD Class I, II and III are 20.3, 34.2 and 29.8, respectively.

Some national comparison data is afforded by the findings released by the American Council on Education.[5] According to their findings, 40.5% of the students at two-year colleges received their degrees on time or were still enrolled when their classes were graduated. For Class I, the corresponding figure is 51.8%, and for Class II, 49.5%. Class III has not yet reached the point where students would be eligible for degrees.

College Status of CDD Students Attending Non-CUNY Institutions

Table 4-8 presents the college status of CDD students attending non-CUNY institutions. The N's presented most likely underestimate the actual figures. This is due mainly to the difficulties involved in locating students once they have left the city. As can be seen in the table, a total of 52 students are known to have entered SUNY colleges, while 93 students are known to have entered private colleges.

The Urban Centers were created by The State University of New York to serve the unemployed and the underemployed. These groups include the high school dropout, the high school graduate, as well as the mature adult. Two Centers were opened to provide career-oriented training with supplementary academic training. A College Adapter program is available for students who wish to prepare for entry into the community colleges. As can be seen in Table 4-8, 26 students entered Urban Centers.

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] As reported in The New York Times, Feb. 14, 1972

Table 4-8

College Discovery Graduates Entering Non-CUNY Institutions

CDD CLASS	SUNY	PRIVATE	URBAN CENTER
I	10	2	20
II	10	17	6
III	14	28	0
IV	18	46	0
TOTAL	52	93	26

College Academic Performance of CDD Graduates by Semester

Tables 4-9 through 4-11 present an overview of two aspects of the academic performance of CDD students in college: grade point average (GPA) and college credits earned. The calculation of GPA's was based only on courses for which letter grades were assigned (A, B, C, D or F). In courses with a pass-fail option, the grade of P was not quantified and was therefore excluded from calculations of GPA. However, a grade of F in a pass-fail course was counted.

For Class I (Table 4-9) the mean grade point average (GPA) for the first semester in college was 1.64, a little better than a D+. For the sixth semester, this average had increased to 2.47, the equivalent of a C+ for those students remaining in college. The reader should keep in mind that these tables present data for senior and community colleges combined, and by the sixth semester many students originally enrolled at community colleges had graduated. Class II (Table 4-10) reveals a similar picture concerning GPA. The mean GPA for the first semester in college was 1.74, which is about half way between a D+ and a C. For the fourth semester, this average was 2.22, a little better than a C. To date, CDD Class III (Table 4-11) does not seem to exhibit the same upward trend. GPA for the first semester was 2.06, a little more than a C, and 1.96 for the second semester, a little less than a C.

The total number of credits a student has successfully completed can be found by summing the categories of credits earned (grades of A,B, C or D) and credits passed. As would be expected, students who continued in college earned higher GPA's, undertook a heavier program load and successfully completed more credits. Class I, on the average, successfully completed 9.14

TABLE 4-9

COLLEGE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF CLASS I GRADUATES BY SEMESTER*

				CREDITS																
		G.P.A.**		Attempted			Earned			Failed			Passed			Incomplete			Withdrawn		
Semester	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%
1st Semester	187	1.64	0.81	13.11	3.84	100.0	9.09	5.28	69.3	1.84	3.12	14.0	0.05	0.37	0.4	0.11	0.69	0.8	2.03	3.65	15.5
2nd Semester	169	1.80	0.86	15.63	3.91	100.0	10.77	6.40	68.9	1.91	2.88	12.2	0.44	1.77	2.8	0.14	0.69	0.9	2.38	3.88	15.2
3rd Semester	144	1.86	0.97	13.28	3.68	100.0	9.01	5.60	67.8	1.60	2.77	12.0	0.05	0.46	0.4	0.23	1.00	1.7	2.39	3.98	18.0
4th Semester	125	2.32	0.85	13.93	3.79	100.0	9.18	5.33	65.9	0.33	1.05	2.4	0.91	2.21	6.5	1.14	2.56	8.2	2.37	3.51	17.0
5th Semester	95	2.34	0.83	14.95	4.77	100.0	11.01	6.39	73.6	0.95	2.14	6.4	0.31	1.11	2.0	0.63	1.81	4.2	2.07	3.36	13.9
6th Semester	60	2.47	0.91	14.81	4.13	100.0	11.44	6.38	77.3	0.28	0.96	1.9	0.18	0.70	1.2	1.27	2.42	8.6	1.63	3.40	11.0

* Combined data for senior and community colleges

** Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 4-10

COLLEGE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF CLASS II GRADUATES BY SEMESTER**

				CREDITS																
		G.P.A.*		Attempted			Earned			Failed			Passed			Incomplete			Withdrawn	
Semester	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%
1st Semester	155	1.74	0.89	13.44	3.15	100.0	9.50	5.24	70.7	1.72	2.90	12.8	0.04	0.34	0.3	0.26	1.41	2.0	1.91	3.24	14.2
2nd Semester	127	2.22	0.82	13.84	2.55	100.0	8.59	5.42	62.1	0.30	1.08	2.2	1.06	2.27	7.7	0.82	2.00	6.0	3.07	3.80	22.2
3rd Semester	108	2.13	0.83	16.12	4.42	100.0	12.27	6.47	76.1	1.14	2.40	7.1	0.16	0.82	1.0	0.65	1.86	4.0	1.89	3.01	11.7
4th Semester	99	2.22	0.83	16.09	4.37	100.0	12.08	6.02	75.1	0.9	2.07	5.7	0.07	0.43	0.4	0.93	1.96	5.8	2.10	3.12	13.1

TABLE 4-11

COLLEGE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF CLASS III GRADUATES BY SEMESTER**

				CREDITS																
		G.P.A.*		Attempted			Earned			Failed			Passed			Incomplete			Withdrawn	
Semester	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%
1st Semester	116	2.06	0.88	13.00	2.96	100.0	8.95	4.92	68.9	1.59	3.12	12.2	0.41	[illegible].99	3.2	0.79	1.65	6.0	1.26	2.85	9.7
2nd Semester	95	1.96	0.93	14.78	3.58	100.0	9.02	5.72	61.0	1.85	3.06	12.5	0.47	1.13	3.2	0.91	1.84	6.2	2.53	3.64	17.1

* Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

** Combined data for senior and community colleges

121

(9.09 + 0.05) credits during the first semester and 11.62 (11.44 + 0.18) during the sixth semester. This same trend is also found in Class II. During the first semester students in this class successfully completed, on the average, 9.54 (9.50 + 0.04) credits and 12.15 (12.08 + 0.07) credits during the fourth semester. Even though the mean GPA for Class III dropped slightly for the second semester, mean credits successfully completed did show a slight increase from 9.36 (8.95 + 0.41) to 9.49 (9.02 + 0.47).

During the first semester of college work, the mean number of credits earned by CDD students was about 70 percent of the mean number of credits they attempted (Class I = 69.3%, Class II = 70.7%, Class III = 68.9%). Failures and withdrawals accounted for approximately equal proportions of the unearned credits, while a small percent of the credits attempted resulted in incompletes.

This ratio of mean number of credits earned to mean number of credits attempted did not, in all cases, remain constant through all semesters. For Class I, students at the end of the sixth semester earned 77.3 percent of the credits attempted, increase of 8.0 percentage points from semester one. Classes II and III also showed an increase in credits earned when the first and last semesters are compared.

For Class I only, it is interesting to note that while the mean number of credits failed remained somewhat constant over the first three semesters, approximately 14 percent of the mean number of credits attempted, this percent dropped to approximately two percent by the sixth semester. During the same time period, the mean number of incomplete credits rose from 0.8 percent during the first semester to 8.6 percent during the sixth.

Comparisons of Academic Performance of Class I, II and III

Table 4-12 presents the means and standard deviations of the GPA's of students in Classes I, II and III for their first semester of college work. Class I had the lowest average GPA and Class III the highest. To assess the significance of the differences among these means, a one-way analysis of variance was performed. The results are presented in Table 4-13. The obtained _F_ value was significant at the .01 level, indicating that it is unlikely that the GPA's of Classes I, II and III had the same average value in the population. To determine which pairs of means differed significantly from each other, Duncan's multiple range test was employed (Edwards, p. 131).[1] At the .05 level, Class III GPA's were significantly higher than those of Classes I and II, on the average. The difference between the means of Class I and Class II was not large enough to achieve significance at this level.

Table 4-14 gives the means and standard deviations of the GPA's of Classes I, II and III for their second semester of college work. Class I had the lowest average GPA and Class II the highest. A one-way analysis of variance (Table 4-15) again revealed significant differences among the means ($p < .01$). Duncan's multiple range test revealed differences significant at the .05 level for the following pairs of means: Classes I and II Classes II and III. The means for Classes I and III did not yield a significant difference.

Table 4-16 presents data on cumulative GPA for all classes based on the number of semesters completed. The mean GPA for those Class I students remaining in college after six semesters is 2.19, a little better than a C. For CDD II, the mean cumulative GPA for those students remaining in college after 4 semesters was 2.16, also a little better than a C. For Class III, the mean cumulative GPA for those students remaining in college after two semesters was 2.00, the equivalent of a C. Table 4-16 reveals, except for

---

[1] Edwards, Allen L. Experimental design in psychological research (3rd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Table 4-12

Grade Point Averages For the First Semester; Classes I, II and III

Class	N	Mean	S.D.
I	187	1.64	0.81
II	155	1.74	0.89
III	116	2.06	0.88

Table 4-13

Summary of Analysis of Variance of First Semester Grade Point Averages: Classes I, II and III

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Classes	2	6.59	9.03*
Within Classes	455	0.73	
Total	457		

* $p < .01$

Table 4-14

Grade Point Averages For the Second Semester:
Classes I, II and III

Class	N	Mean	S.D.
I	169	1.80	0.86
II	127	2.21	0.82
III	95	1.96	0.93

Table 4-15

Summary of Analysis of Variance
of Second Semester Grade Point Averages:
Classes I, II and III

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Between Classes	2	6.21	8.28*
Within Classes	388	0.75	
Total	390		

* $p < .01$

TABLE 4-16

Cumulative GPA's by Semester for CDD I, II and III*

	CDD I			CDD II			CDD III		
Number of Semesters	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
1	187	1.64	0.81	155	1.74	0.89	116	2.06	0.88
2	169	1.72	0.69	127	1.93	0.74	94	2.00	0.77
3	143	1.83	0.62	108	2.09	0.55			
4	124	2.01	0.54	99	2.16	0.50			
5	91	2.09	0.54						
6	57	2.19	0.72						

* Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

Class III, a pattern of small but steady increases of mean cumulative GPA is similar to when mean GPA's were reported by semester.

Summary

This chapter provided data on the college status and performance of CDD Classes I, II and III. Academic performance data (grade point averages, number of credits attempted, etc.) were reported for those students attending The City University of New York. Due to difficulties in acquiring transcripts of students enrolled in other institutions, only enrollment figures are reported for those students.

A total of 493 students in Classes I, II and III enrolled for their first semester in colleges within City University. By September 1971, 52 had graduated with Associate of Arts degrees and 222 were still enrolled. At the end of six semesters of college, Class I students had a cumulative grade point average that was slightly above C. A similar cumulative GPA was attained by Class II students after 4 semesters. Class III students' mean GPA after two semesters was exactly a C.

CHAPTER 5

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION AND ADMISSION TO COLLEGE

Class IV

The fourth class of the College Discovery and Development Program was initially comprised of 529 students who entered the program in September 1968. Throughout the following three years 32 students entered the program as late admissions increasing the original group of 529 to a total of 561 students (Class IV). Two hundred and twenty-four (39.9%) of the 561 Class IV population left the CDD program for various reasons. Most of these students transferred to other high schools and continued their education.

Of the 561 students, 322 (57.4%) were graduated from high school by January 1972. Academic diplomas were awarded to 147 (45.7%) of the graduates and the remaining 175 (54.3%) students received general diplomas (Table 5-1).

The post-secondary disposition of Class IV is summarized in Table 5-2. Of the 322 high school graduates, 273 (84.8%) are known to have entered post-secondary institutions. Among these 273 college entrants, 209 (76.6%) entered The City University of New York, while the remaining 64 (23.4%) entered The State University of New York or other colleges. Twenty-two (6.8%) of the 322 graduates are known not to have entered colleges. To date it has not been possible to verify the post-high school activities of the remaining 27 graduates of Class IV.

Table 5-1

Diplomas Issued

Class IV

CENTER	TOTAL	GENERAL N	GENERAL %	ACADEMIC N	ACADEMIC %
I	66	41	62.1	25	37.9
II	63	27	42.9	36	57.1
III	64	31	48.4	33	51.5
IV	58	40	68.9	18	31.0
V	71	36	50.7	35	49.3
TOTAL	322*	175	54.3	147	45.7

*Includes nine late graduates

Table 5-2

POST-SECONDARY DISPOSITION OF CDD IV GRADUATES

(SHOWING PDD GRADUATES)

	CDD IV TOTAL			PDD TOTAL			NON-PDD TOTAL		
PROGRAM	N	% of Grads (base 322)	% of Entrants (base 561)	N	% of Grads (base 38)	% of Entrants (base 60)	N	% of Grads (base 284)	% of Entrants (base 501)
4 year CUNY	99	30.7	17.6	17	44.7	28.3	82	28.9	16.4
2 year CUNY	110	34.2	19.6	9	23.7	15.0	101	35.6	20.2
SUNY	18	5.6	3.2	3	7.9	5.0	15	5.3	3.0
Other	46	14.3	8.2	3	7.9	5.0	43	15.1	8.6
TOTALS									
High School Grads	322	100.0	57.4	38	100.0	63.3	284	100.0	56.7
College Entrants	273	84.8	48.7	32	84.2	53.3	241	84.9	48.1
Not At College	22	6.8	3.9	2	5.3	3.3	20	7.0	4.0
Not Located	27	8.4	4.8	4	10.5	6.7	23	8.1	4.6

As a result of a consortium arrangement between City University and Columbia University, 60 of the Class IV students were able to participate in Project Double Discovery (PDD--an Upward Bound Program). This project complemented the CDD program by utilizing the summer months to further help students reach their college goals. The students were given an opportunity to attend high school level classes while living in dormitories at Columbia University during the summer. By January 1972, 38 of the original 60 PDD students (63.3%) had completed high school. Of these graduates, 32 (84.2%) were accepted by and entered colleges.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY

In June 1971 the College Discovery and Development Program completed its sixth year of continuous activity. During this sixth year the general purposes and implementation plans of CDD continued to be very similar to those of the previous years, although the official proposals for this year's funding included a number of newly stated specifically expressed behavioral objectives.

Student Population

The sixth consecutive class enrolled in the College Discovery and Development Program was a population essentially similar to those in the previous five groups. Class VI showed no drastic changes from its predecessors in age, sex distribution, family structure or living conditions. However, this class was probably less well off economically, although it reported a mean gross income of $25.42 per family member per week as compared with $18.61 for Class I. A very considerable inflation of costs, especially of those for food and rent has occurred over the five years from September 1965 (Class I) to September 1970 (Class VI). Thus for Class I the mean monthly rent paid had been $78.24; for Class VI this cost had risen to $105.86 per month.

Class VI was also not markedly different from its predecessors with regard to ethnicity, with approximately 59% Black, 24% Puerto Rican, 3% Oriental and 15% "Other". Since we determine eligibility from among all those referred to us by counselors and since enrollee selection from this panel of eligible students is made by the host high school staff from ethnically void documents, these proportions probably represent a fair ethnic mix for the kind of child sought in terms of their educational needs. It is possible that the counselors and community agency personnel who refer all students may exert ethnic selection forces in their choice of students for referral. But, if so, this is in no way systematic, it is unintended, it is in antagonism to their instructions, and represents an inherent response of this large number of referring persons to the social forces operating in the city at the time.

This class was also similar to previous groups in its history of mobility. Three-quarters of the students had previously attended three or more schools at application time and the mean tenure at their present home address had been only six years: even this figure was skewed markedly downward by the unique population of one center, 52% of whose members live in family owned houses.

Class VI students were also closely similar to prior classes in terms of their previous scholastic averages and attendance: their standardized test scores at entrance showed a small decrease in mean mathematics and reading scores from those of earlier classes. Again, although their mean reading score was approximately at grade level, their mathematics scores showed a mean of one full year below grade. However, as in previous classes, a large fraction (51.3%) were reading below grade before entrance, a larger fraction (65.4%) were below grade in mathematics and 84% of the class had ninth grade averages below 79% or were below reasonable college prep level in both respects. Table 2-40, page 58, is an instructive summary regarding Class VI but its use of statistical means conceals extensive variations with regard to all criteria.

Academic Performance in High School

The academic performance of CDD students in the high schools during this sixth year is reported in Chapter III. Analysis of the data shows few changes from the patterns of performance seen in previous years. Achievement was generally adequate and student persistence continued good with a somewhat higher proportion (87.8%) of those who left the CDD program continuing on in high school education elsewhere.

The fall semester of the 1970-71 school year saw students in Classes IV, V, and VI obtain mean general averages of about 69, 72, and 72 respectively. The corresponding mean general averages for the spring semester were 72, 71, and 70. Total absences for the school year were about 22, 18, and 17 for Classes IV, V, and VI respectively.

A general downward trend in Regents examination grades continued as well as some decrease in the proportion of students who attempted these examinations as compared with previous years.

High School Graduation and College Admission

Class IV, which had entered tenth grade in September 1968, completed the high school phase of CDD in June 1971. Of the total of 561 (529 original plus 32 later enrollees) who had been enrolled in this class during the three year period 322 (57.4%) were graduated. Of the 322 high school graduates, 273 (84.8%) applied to and have been confirmed as accepted by post-secondary institutions: those entering CUNY totaled 209 (76.6% of the college entrants) and 64 (23.4% of the college entrants) entered SUNY or other colleges. Twenty-two (6.8%) of the 322 graduates have been confirmed as not entering colleges and the activities of the remaining 27 graduates have not been validated.

College Progress of CDD Graduates

Once again, detailed reporting on the college progress of CDD graduates was limited to those students enrolled in the various colleges of The City University of New York. A total of 493 students in Classes I, II, and III enrolled for the first semester in colleges of the City University. By September 1971, 52 had graduated with Associate of Arts degrees and 222 were still enrolled. Class I students had a cumulative grade point average slightly above a "C" after six semesters of college. A similar cumulative GPA was attained by Class II students after four semesters. After two semesters the mean GPA of Class III students was exactly a "C".

Obtaining reliable information regarding the college progress of graduates of the high school phase has been found to be a [illegible]ficult, expensive and frustrating task. Student authorization for release of transcripts is required by almost every institution. This is a praiseworthy demonstration by the colleges of their concern and administrative procedural back-up of the best possible principles of personal privacy and maintenance of constitutional guarantees, but it has made an adequate follow-up investigation nearly impossible.

In order to ensure accuracy no data can be used except information from actual transcripts received. For CDD graduates now attending CUNY colleges we were able to obtain considerably more data than from those now enrolled in SUNY or private institutions. Even in CUNY, however, a considerable number of students disappear from our samples. For example, as a consequence of college transfer or change of address of a student, his authorization for new transcript may become unavailable until (and if) it becomes possible to relocate him and obtain his signed authorization.

Transcripts which have been received and analyzed show the following general trends: CDD students continue in college at a slightly higher rate than "regular" freshmen in the same institutions and a considerably higher rate than "Open Admissions" freshmen; CDD students earn slightly lower Grade Point Averages than "regular" freshmen and higher GPA's than "Open Admissions" freshmen in each institution; a small number of CDD graduates of Class I have earned baccalaureate degress; a much greater number have earned associate degrees, generally taking one or more semesters above the four term minimum; a considerable number of students with associate degrees have transferred into junior year baccalaureate programs.

It is of more than passing interest to note the original CDD Planning Committee's general prognosis that, without intervention, 90% of the kind of youngsters selected for the program would leave high school before graduation. As of the present about two of every three originally enrolled students were graduated from CDD host high schools; nine of every ten graduated actually entered colleges. A considerable number of these enrollees have transcripts showing acceptable college progress. This does not include the one-quarter to one-third of graduates who entered SUNY or private colleges for whom transcripts have been less readily available but for whom impressionistic reports show somewhat higher performance and retention (as might be expected from the generally higher academic standing in high school and the considerably above average financial aid these institutions offered).

The general findings for CDD students whose college records can be studied show a pattern of progress not greatly different from that of their non-CDD classmates in each college. The mean grade point average tends to rise with each additional semester, probably in consequence of the withdrawal of less successful students as well as a result of increasing effectiveness of individual students with time, maturity and experience. The ratio of credits earned to credits attempted also shows a steady increase from semester to semester while the proportion of credits failed declined. This too can be attributed to upward attenuation of the sample. There is a slow increase of number of credits graded "incomplete" with increasing experience and age of students.

Finally, as of the date of this writing, a slowly increasing roster of glowing success stories is emerging. A recent summary showed two teachers in a CDD high school who are graduates of Class I and another graduate of 1968 who is teaching psychology in a CUNY college in which she is enrolled in a Ph.D. program. It included four students first recorded as drop-outs from a CUNY college after two years but who were later located on the dean's list as seniors at a prestigious Ivy League school; it includes a growing cluster of graduate students as well as a number of successful professional workers. We are beginning to be able to show proud taxpayers who held Aid to Dependent Children numbers a few short years ago but who are today proof that the "talented 10 percent" exists among the poor and can be both discovered and developed.

REFERENCES

Brody, L., Harris, B., and Lachica, G., Discovering and Developing the College Potential of Disadvantaged High School Youth: A Report of the Third Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program, Report #69-1, Office of Research and Evaluation, The City University of New York, March 1969.

Edwards, Allen L., Experimental Design in Psychological Research (3rd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Harris, B., and Brody, L., Discovering and Developing the College Potential of Disadvantaged High School Youth: A Report of the Fourth Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program, Report #70-13, Office of Research and Evaluation, The City University of New York, June 1970.

The New York Times. (Feb. 14; Sept. 12; Nov. 18, 1971)

APPENDIX A

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SUMMARY TABLES FOR CHAPTER 2

Table A-1

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

AGE IN YEARS

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	152.523	3.68*
Within Centers	518	41.409	

* p <.01

Table A-2

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

NUMBER OF ROOMS PER HOUSEHOLD

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	18.42	11.48*
Within Centers	413	1.60	

* p <.01

Table A-3

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	_F_
Between Centers	4	3.39	0.87*
Within Centers	512	3.88	

* non-significant (p >.05)

Table A-4

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

NUMBER OF PERSONS PER ROOM PER HOUSEHOLD

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	_F_
Between Centers	4	0.99	5.59*
Within Centers	413	0.18	

* $p < .01$

Table A-5

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MONTHLY RENT

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	30342.00	19.12*
Within Centers	435	1586.65	

* $p < .01$

Table A-6

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

TOTAL WEEKLY INCOME

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	21969.31	7.32*
Within Centers	447	3002.51	

* $p < .01$

Table A-7

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

YEARS AT PRESENT ADDRESS

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	163.45	7.35*
Within Centers	499	22.23	

* $p < .01$

Table A-8

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

ADJUSTED LIFE CHANCES SCALE SCORE

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	83.65	19.32*
Within Centers	517	4.33	

* $p < .01$

Table A-9

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MAT READING - PARAGRAPH MEANING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	*F*
Between Centers	4	14.88	4.40*
Within Centers	412	3.38	

*$p < .01$

Table A-10

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MAT READING - VOCABULARY

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	*F*
Between Centers	4	9.85	2.95*
Within Centers	409	3.34	

* $p < .05$

Table A-11

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MAT READING - AVERAGE

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	11.43	4.01*
Within Centers	448	2.85	

* $p < .01$

Table A-12

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MAT MATHEMATICS - COMPUTATION

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	10.80	6.28*
Within Centers	306	1.72	

* $p < .01$

Table A-13

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MAT MATHEMATICS - PROBLEM SOLVING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	6.98	4.14 *
Within Centers	305	1.68	

* $p < .01$

Table A-14

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MAT MATHEMATICS - AVERAGE

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	9.73	6.42*
Within Centers	343	1.52	

* $p < .01$

Table A-15

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

SEVENTH GRADE GENERAL AVERAGE

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	*F*
Between Centers	4	176.05	2.39*
Within Centers	434	73.55	

* $p < .05$

Table A-16

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

EIGHTH GRADE GENERAL AVERAGE

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	*F*
Between Centers	4	132.46	1.94*
Within Centers	459	68.3	

* non-significant ($p > .05$)

Table A-17

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MID-YEAR NINTH GRADE GENERAL AVERAGE

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	419.95	6.85*
Within Centers	513	61.35	

* $p < .01$

Table A-18

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT

(Fall Semester Ninth Grade)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	131.52	3.35*
Within Centers	467	39.28	

* $p < .05$

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SUMMARY TABLES FOR CHAPTER 3

SUMMARY TABLES FOR CHAPTER 3

Table B-1

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

GENERAL AVERAGE

FALL

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	470.63	3.34*
Within Centers	365	140.91	

* $p < .05$

Table B-2

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

MATH REGENTS

FALL

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	488.3	1.84*
Within Centers	91	264.6	

* non-significant ($p > .05$)

Table B-3

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

FALL ABSENCES

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	257.32	3.25*
Within Centers	364	79.14	

* $p < .05$

Table B-4

Analysis of Variance - Class V

GENERAL AVERAGES

FALL

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	754.28	6.16*
Within Centers	474	122.42	

* $p < .01$

Table B-5

Analysis of Variance - Class V

MATH REGENTS

FALL

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	_F_
Between Centers	4	1455.03	5.27*
Within Centers	89	275.89	

* _P_ < .01

Table B-6

Analysis of Variance - Class V

FALL ABSENCES

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	_F_
Between Centers	4	303.71	3.87*
Within Centers	474	78.4	

* _p_ < .01

Table B-7

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

GENERAL AVERAGES

FALL

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	757.44	6.57*
Within Centers	514	115.31	

* p <.01

Table B-8

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MATH REGENTS

FALL

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	1036.41	3.12*
Within Centers	105	331.95	

* p <.05

Table B-9

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

FALL ABSENCES

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	103.12	14.35*
Within Centers	514	14.68	

* p <.01

Table B-10

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

GENERAL AVERAGES

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	1313.65	11.09*
Within Centers	329	118.436	

* p <.01

Table B-11

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

ENGLISH REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	480.81	7.73*
Within Centers	225	62.17	

* $p < .01$

Table B-12

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

HISTORY REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	325.47	3.43*
Within Centers	270	94.91	

* $p < .01$

Table B-13

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

MATH REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	1913.09	7.46*
Within Centers	89	256.43	

* p <.01

Table B-14

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

SCIENCE REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	1302.73	10.22*
Within Centers	97	127.43	

* p <.01

Table B-15

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

FOREIGN LANGUAGE REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	379.72	1.78*
Within Centers	73	213.78	

* non-significant ($p > .05$)

Table B-16

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

SPRING ABSENCES

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	475.89	4.57*
Within Centers	283	104.02	

* $p < .01$

Table B-17

Analysis of Variance - Class IV

TOTAL ABSENCES 1970-71

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	950.82	3.82*
Within Centers	273	248.63	

* p <.01

Table B-18

Analysis of Variance - Class V

GENERAL AVERAGES

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	809.28	6.61*
Within Centers	451	122.41	

* p <.01

Table B-19

Analysis of Variance - Class V

MATH REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	1994.25	5.65*
Within Centers	249	352.64	

* $p < .01$

Table B-20

Analysis of Variance - Class V

SCIENCE REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	3518.65	23.43*
Within Centers	287	150.15	

* $p < .01$

Table B-21

Analysis of Variance - Class V

FOREIGN LANGUAGE REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	1391.66	5.73*
Within Centers	218	242.74	

* p <.01

Table B-22

Analysis of Variance - Class V

SPRING ABSENCES

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	607.69	5.42*
Within Centers	443	112.05	

* p <.01

Table B-23

Analysis of Variance - Class V

TOTAL ABSENCES 1970-71

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	780.62	3.39*
Within Centers	438	229.94	

* p <.01

Table B-24

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

GENERAL AVERAGES

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	316.95	2.15*
Within Centers	472	147.51	

* non-significant (p >.05)

Table B-25

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

MATH REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	*F*
Between Centers	4	2135.07	4.78*
Within Centers	275	446.53	

* *p* <.01

Table B-26

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

SCIENCE REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	*F*
Between Centers	4	3442.43	23.04*
Within Centers	408	149.40	

* *p* <.01

Table B-27

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

FOREIGN LANGUAGE REGENTS

SPRING

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	4168.35	13.74*
Within Centers	249	303.37	

* p <.01

Table B-28

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

SPRING ABSENCES

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	367.62	3.56*
Within Centers	464	103.20	

* p <.01

Table B-29

Analysis of Variance - Class VI

TOTAL ABSENCES 1970-71

SOURCE OF VARIATION	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE	F
Between Centers	4	544.19	2.39*
Within Centers	456	227.94	

* $p < .05$